DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 617 EA 004 169

TITLE	Proceedings: National Seminar on Year-Round Education (4th, San Diego, California, February 23-25, 1972).
INSTITUTION	San Diego County Dept. of Education, Calif.
PUB DATE	Feb 72
NOTE	153p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Innovation; Evaluation; Feasibility Studies; Models; School Calendars; *School Schedules; *Seminars; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; *Year Round Schools

ABSTRACT

More than 900 consultants, participants, and committee members representing nearly every State and many foreign countries attended the seminar. This document consists of 31 seminar presentations that include primarily descriptions of specific programs as well as information relative to community relations, curriculum planning, evaluation models, teacher roles, and some financial implications. (MLF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Proceedings

4th NATIONAL SEMINAR on YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

February 23-25, 1972
SAN DIEGO
CALIFORNIA

sponsored by

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SAN DIEGO COUNTY

EA 004 169

Foreword

It is a great pleasure to sponsor the 4th National Seminar on Year-Round Education. The more than 900 consultants, participants, and committee members constitute the largest group thus far at a Seminar that is rapidly gaining in importance and value. Nearly every state and many foreign countries have representatives meeting here this week.

We appreciate the hard work of the Seminar Planning Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee who have had the responsibility to keep the movement growing between Seminars.

We also wish to thank the consultants for taking time from their busy schedules to share their experiences and wisdom with us. Most of the presentations are contained in this volume. Those you did not attend, you should read carefully. There is much to be learned.

Best wishes as you move to a new site next year.

M. TED DIXON
Superintendent of Schools
Department of Education
San Diego County

STATEMENT ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION*

It is recognized that the standard 180-day school year as it now prevails in most schools is not universally satisfactory; nor has any operating program for a year-round school yet proved to be universally acceptable.

It is recognized that a plan which may be appropriate in one community situation may not be acceptable in another situation; and that the extended programs which seem to have been most acceptable are those which provided flexibility or optional attendance.

It is recognized that every individual is unique and if each is to learn what he needs to know at his own best rate, the school curriculum must be individualized.

It is recognized that the time schedules of individuals and families are continuing to become more diverse and that a student's time in school must be adaptable to this changing situation.

It is recognized that financial resources of any community, state and the nation are limited and must be allocated on a priority basis and that educational programs, including the school calendar, must be designed to obtain optimum economic efficiency.

It is therefore recommended that each State:

1. Take appropriate action to provide enabling legislation and/or policy permitting flexibility of programming so that various patterns of year-round education may be explored at the local level.

2. Take appropriate action to provide state school aid on a prorated basis for extended school programs.

3. Encourage experimental or exploratory programs for year-round education through financial incentive or grant.

It is recommended that each local school system:

1. Consider ways, including year-round education, in which the educational program can be improved in terms of (a) providing a quality education with equality in educational opportunity, (b) adapting to the community and family living patterns and, (c) attaining optimum economic efficiency.

---

*Adopted by the Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education at the Final Session, April 7, 1970.

2. Include representation of those who would be affected by the changes in the school schedule in the planning for a year-round education program, including teachers, parents, students, and other interested groups; and provide the public with adequate information about the proposed plan before it is adopted as a mandatory change.

3. Carefully assess the adequacy of the financial resources and current school facilities, including a careful analysis of comparative budgets, before adopting a new schedule.

4. Select and assign staff which will be both effective in terms of the school program and fair and equitable in terms of the demands placed on staff.

5. Carefully develop budgets that will adequately provide for initiating and operating the proposal program and assess adequacy of school facilities before adopting a new schedule. This includes payment to teachers on a prorated basis for additional time worked.

6. Provide, in the initial planning, for the institutionalization of the program if it meets expectations (i.e., do not accept a state, federal or other grant to initiate such a program unless the intent is to adopt it as the regular school schedule if it proves successful and acceptable.)

It is recommended that the U.S. Office of Education and the Education Commission of the States:

1. Encourage experimentation in year-round education.

2. Rigorously examine all year-round education models which seem to be widely acceptable in terms of well-defined, established criteria.

3. Foster the adoption of these plans or models which have demonstrated their value and acceptability so that nationwide patterns may emerge that are compatible with each other.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword
Statement on Year-Round Education
Table of Contents
Curriculum and the Year-Round School: A New Vehicle, New Models 2
The Teacher and the Year-Round School 3, 4
The Teacher and the Year-Round School 3, 4
Artesia CA: The ABC Unified Flexible All-Year Program 5
Molalla or: Molalla Elementary School--A Four Quarter Twelve-Month School . 6
La Mesa-Spring Valley CA: La Mesa-Spring Valley Year-Round School for Continuous Education 7
There's No Mistery, or Misery, in Scheduling Year-Round Schools 9
The Elective Quarter Plan 10
Hayward CA: Park 4-Quarter Elementary School 11
Valley View IL: The Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan 12
Hinesburg VT: 45-15 Multiple Access Curriculum and Calendar. 13
No News Isn't Good News: Developing a Community Relations Program for Year-Round Education 14
Preparing Teachers for all Seasons 15
Four O'Clock High 16A
The Parkway Program--"The Everywhere School" 16B
Evaluation Models for Year-Round Schools 17
Everywhere School (Sand) 18A
Implementing the Multi-Unit School 18B
Chula Vista CA: Year-Round School Program 19
Franklin Pierce, Tacoma WA: The 4-1-4-1-1 Interim Month System of Year-Round School Operation 20
Dade County (Miami) FL: Quinmester--Extended School Year Program 21
Economic and Financial Implications of Year-Round Education 22
Developing a Plan for a Feasibility Study 23A
Developing, Implementing, and Analyzing a Survey Instrument 23B
The State Department's Role: The Michigan Experience 23C
Year-Round School and the Educational Audit 24
Rochester PA: Rochester Area Optional Four Quarters 26
Becky-David, St. Charles MO: Becky-David Year-Round School Plan 27
Life Style, Living Patterns, and the Year-Round School 28A
A Reaction: Life Style, Living Patterns, and the Year-Round School 28B
A Reaction: Life Style, Living Patterns, and the Year-Round School 28D
Ad Hoc Committee on Year-Round Education
Seminar Planning Committee
Seminar Consultants

CURRICULUM AND THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL: A NEW VEHICLE, NEW MODELS

P. Marvin Barbula

May I preface this summary with the story of the farmer who read in the newspaper an advertisement for a person with two P. H. D. 's who had written at least six books and who was an orator as well as a top administrator. The salary for the job was $50,000.00. The farmer immediately boarded a bus for New York City, took a cab to the office of the company which placed the advertisement, and sought out the personnel department. Meeting the secretary to the director of personnel, he inquired if this advertisement and the requirements were correct as printed. "You want a person with two P. H. D. 's who has written at least six books and who is an orator as well as a top administrator?" The secretary said this was correct. To which the farmer, dressed in overalls, replied, "Well, don't count on me!" I feel that my qualifications allow me to share with you only a few thoughts on the curriculum of the year-round school and these thoughts may not be new vehicles or new models but maybe they'll stimulate your thinking so that you might create new vehicles and new models.

First, year-round education is not new, as you know, and is not untried. Early events can be traced to the Bluffton, Indiana, four-quarter, staggered program in 1904. Vocational agriculture classes many times have been operated on a year-round basis in rural areas for the past forty years. AASA published a monograph on year-round schools in 1960. In a 1970 AASA monograph on year-round schools, Lyndon Johnson in an address said, "Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls--a school unit of doors which open into the entire community. Tomorrow's school will reach out to the places that enrich the human spirit--to the museums, the theaters, the art galleries, to the parks, and rivers, and mountains. Tomorrow's school will be a shopping center for human services. It will employ its buildings 'round the clock and teachers 'round the year." May I add, let's hope that year-round education is not a zeitgeist--merely a spirit of the times.

Study committees on year-round education were in operation in California in 1951. At that time, documents called it the twelve months' school plan. A 1963 edition of the Los Angeles Times headlined, "How to 'Expand' the Schools." To quote the editorial, "We have a 150-year-old tradition of long summer vacations that will be hard to change. But the tradition is an anachronism in an urban society. It had validity when 80% of the population lived on the farms and the children were needed to work the crops, but that day is gone."

Why Am I Here? What are the implications of the year-round school year for the engine of any school district--the curriculum itself? Can the school calendar be remodeled without extensive curriculum revision? Yes, the calendar can be changed without effecting the school curriculum in any major way. I am here to

C

VI

say, don't merely *change* a calendar, *rethink* the curriculum of the school so that improved results might be obtained in the process. I am here to say that the greatest mistake one can make in life is to be continually fearing you will make one. Rethink the curriculum of your school. Step back from it and take a look! Occasionally it doesn't hurt any of us to step back from what we're doing in our professional and personal lives and rethink what's happening. Unfortunately, for me at least--but this is probably not the case for you--I had an easier time looking at possibilities for the fifteen days on the 45-15 plan than I did when I looked at the forty-five days. I'll explain the why of this later. I am here to say that the best time, the most opportune time you'll have to look at the curriculum of the school is now, if you're changing the calendar. I am here to say *invest in your staff* when you think of year-round education. Teachers and administrators need think time before you enter into a new curriculum and maybe some of the fifteen day recesses can become "think tanks" for teachers, administrators, and para-professionals.

My point is to build in finances for staff development, curriculum revision, and released time to a greater degree than has been done in the past. Think of the people who'll be implementing the curriculum. To answer *my* first question, why am I here--I am here to say that the curriculum is in a large measure the staff. Invest in them, provide time for rethinking of the curriculum and take ahold of the greatest opportunity that the year-round program offers--curriculum revision.

After exploring the sources of the Mississippi, John C. Fremont reached Prairie du Chien in the late autumn of 1839. A steamboat was at the landing ready to depart for the southland. Fremont decided that he would wait for the next steamer in order that he might have a few days' rest. The next morning he awoke to find the river frozen over. There was not another boat until spring. Fremont wrote, "I had to learn two things that winter: how to skate and the value of a day." Time waits for no man. If we have planned some kind of deed this year, we had better do it right now.

Please don't just change a calendar without looking at curriculum implications. The year can be gone without some preparation to give it value--don't wait for the river to freeze over or for school to get "set" before finding a time to think about curriculum revision. The heart or engine of the school district is the curriculum--the curriculum makes it go! What are the implications for curriculum change? There are implications of looking not only at what is the present curriculum, but of looking beyond it. There are implications for accountability in curriculum by establishing criterion--referenced curriculum or for those who prefer, goals and objectives for the classes. There are implications for assignment of personnel and for landscaping the classroom or loft. There are other implications which need to be considered at all levels of the curriculum. There are specifics which need to be considered. Can you change a calendar without effecting curriculum? Yes, but even then some adjustments are necessary.

How might you use the fifteen days? How might you change what happens in the forty-five days? The curriculum of the year-round school--new vehicles and new models--is based on the premise of recognized need for change and desire to improve. Detailing some of these specifics is the contine of this program.

3 and 4

THE TEACHER AND THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

Larry Sibelman

While there are several areas of immediate self-interest to teachers involved with any form of year-round education, teachers are also concerned with the broader educational and social implications of such programs. In this presentation the issues of immediate concern to teachers will be made clear but at the same time an attempt will be made to assess the general implications of year-round education. Since teachers are interested in individual students, their education and society as a whole, it would be incorrect to limit a teachers' perspective on this sort of question to simply the obvious issues of wages, hours, working conditions, fringe benefits and other pecuniary considerations.

Despite some opinions to the contrary, the American Federation of Teachers is vitally concerned with issues that transcend the direct self-interest of teachers. At a time when public education is under attack from many quarters we are very interested in any program aimed at improvement and extension of the education in American society.

Philosophical and social assessments of year-round education can only be made in relation to the specifics of any given program. The purposes for the development of a program will frame the nature of the program itself. For example, if the purpose of the program is saving tax money, the nature of the program will flow from that purpose. If the purpose of the program is extending educational opportunities for the individual student a different program will result. Teachers will, in the main, support programs aimed at extending education but cannot be counted on for support of programs primarily designed to save money. The reason for this is simple. Money saving programs invariably have the effect of either reducing educational opportunities or reducing teacher benefits and working conditions. We all know of the continual and widespread tug of war between teachers' wages and class size. Boards of education often present teachers with the choice of an increase in class size in order to pay for an increase in salary.

On the other hand, a program stemming from a desire to expand educational opportunities would have wide support from teachers. This is especially true if through such a program teachers had a chance to improve their annual income.

Unfortunately, much of the discussion about year-round schooling seems to center around the financial benefits to school districts from extending plant utilization through an all year program. The money saved by full-time utilization of school facilities would vary from situation to situation, but it is possible to make some general appraisals. Personnel costs represent the largest cost item in the operating costs of most school systems. If the school year was expanded and teacher compensation was increased in proportion to the expansion of the length of the school year, and if other personnel costs were likewise expanded the result would be a substantial increase in annual cost. The only way such programs could result in financial benefits to school districts would be to have teachers and other personnel work longer for the same compensation. That is unthinkable!

Most teachers feel that present levels of compensation are inadequate considering the qualifications and responsibilities demanded of them. The idea of extending their work load without compensation would be rejected.

There is a second aspect to an all year school program designed to reduce costs and that has to do with the students. Under such programs the student would make greater use of the schoolplant each year but obviously would have to stay in school for a shortened period of time in total or no money would be saved. This means a younger school leaving age. The value of such a situation is questionable, especially in urban society where job opportunities for young people are limited.

Well, then if the focus of a year-round school program is to save money, teachers would and should reject the program because meaningful amounts of money can be saved only by reducing teachers' compensation and throwing students into a job market at an age when they are unemployable.

If the motivation for expanding to a year-round program is to extend the educational offering to students, wide support from teachers can be expected. In recent years most school systems have suffered from extensive cutbacks in program due to budget shortages. When this is coupled with the general failure of urban districts to achieve acceptable levels of education with minority student populations, a crisis of immense magnitude is evident.

Considering this crisis in public education and the variety of panaceas floating around the educational horizon such as voucher schemes, performance contracting, behavioral objectives, PPBS, accountability and so forth, it seems somewhat idyllic to be talking about an expansion of the school year which would result in substantial increases in education costs at this time. Nevertheless, the question of year-round education is raised and responses called for.

The teaching population nationwide and in any large school system is heterogeneous in terms of age, sex, marital status, family income and several other significant variables. Therefore, an extension of the school year would be viewed differently by different individuals. Many of the women in teaching were attracted to their positions by the present shorter school year. They wish to be gainfully employed but prefer the long summer vacation for a variety of reasons. Most men in teaching regardless of the particular position on salary schedules would enthusiastically embrace any opportunity to improve their income through an extension of the school year. In consideration of this variance, a year-round program should contain voluntary features for teacher service.

A system that contained year-round vacation periods would also have to have voluntary participation by teachers. The prospect of a teacher attempting to coordinate the vacation periods of two or three children and that of a husband or wife as well seems certain to raise difficulties.

Most teacher salary schedules require advanced education as a component of salary advance. Staggered vacation periods would raise difficulties with college and university schedules for teachers. Shortened vacation periods would inhibit professional growth unless some regular system of abbreviated sabbatical leaves or educational leaves was provided.

Such considerations come into play when programs are envisioned which use the school plant on a rotating basis with teachers and students staggering semesters in a quarter system. Additional problems appear for high school students in terms of work opportunities. Presently, vacations for workers in private industry tend to be concentrated during the summer months. This opens opportunities for students and teachers as well to find temporary employment. It would seem that such opportunities would be limited to students turned loose outside of the summer months.

While the American Federation of Teachers has no clear policy at present on this issue of year-round education, certainly all of these things would need definition and resolution before favorable consideration could be given.

Even though the present traditional school year is an outgrowth of the needs of an agrarian society there are factors which still make the system legitimate. Teaching school is a very demanding occupation. Periodic chances for respite, recreation and renewal are an important need. Students have similar needs to get away from the academic grind for a time each year. It may well be that the most reasonable approach would be to simply provide opportunities for an extension of the present school year for those students who can benefit from it and for those teachers who wish to teach longer.

An example of this approach is the summer program proposed in Los Angeles by the United Teachers Los Angeles. What we proposed there was a combination of summer school for students and inservice education for teachers all on a voluntary basis as an adjunct to the regular school year. Our proposal included two four-week sessions. A teacher could teach one or both or teach one and attend renewal and advancement courses for the second session. Students could likewise attend either one or both sessions. A variety of course offerings for students would include enrichment, remediation and normal courses. Teachers could receive compensation for an additional eight weeks of teaching at their option if they taught or attended inservice courses. Students could accelerate their progress through school on an individual basis. Those that needed to work could opt not to attend.

Attaching an additional four-week session would in effect keep the schools open on a year-round basis with two weeks off in December and one week off in the spring. In effect what would be produced is a tri-semester system with the summer semester a flexible semester consisting of three four-week sessions operating on an optional basis for both students and teachers. Such a program would substantially increase overall costs, but it would expand opportunities for students and teachers on a voluntary basis.

One point ought to be emphasized. Schools are now suffering from under-funding. A prior step to moving to an expansion of the school year should be beefing up the offering during the regular school year. We need lower class sizes, more counseling services, improved maintenance and custodial services, better salaries and a host of other improvements. The trouble is that the past few years have seen budget cuts and reductions in programs and services. While such year-round concepts as the one mentioned above would be welcomed by teachers, general improvements cannot be ignored.

We are grateful for this opportunity to present our perspective to this 4th National Seminar on Year-Round Education.

3,4

THE TEACHER AND THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

Dorothy Brooksby

For the purposes of this paper, "year-round school program" is defined as the restructuring of the school year in order to provide opportunity for continuous education throughout the year, with appropriate curriculum modifications and reform. This concept differs from that of the traditional two-semester school year (with the option of "summer school" attendance) in that it provides the opportunity for year-round education. This restructuring could take the form of a four-quarter year; a trimester, extended school year; or a "continuous instruction" plan, with varying options for voluntary or mandatory participation by students, teachers, and other school personnel. The important thing is that the year-round school plan developed in any given community meet local needs and reflect local goals and educational aspirations.

The designs for the year-round school concept considered by the Committee fall into two categories: first, the compulsory plan in which children have an attendance option.

In modern America's rapidly changing, pluralistic society, it is apparent that if public education is to meet children's needs, dramatic improvement of educational opportunity is imperative. One of the areas offering the greatest potential for improvement is restructuring the school year into a year-round operation.

There are four reasons for considering a rescheduled school year: economy, improvement of teacher status, desire for improved and enriched education for all pupils, and need for pupil acceleration.

There are a lot of different names associated with the concept of year-round school.

Expanded school year (ESY)--expanded school--but they all have the same basic aim. The aim is to make maximum use of all facilities and to eliminate the need for constructing new schools, furnishing and staffing them.

Possible Advantages of the Year-Round Schools Which Teachers Feel Are Important

There is the possibility that with year-round school programs, school districts could improve their public relations positions by regaining lost confidence and support of the general public. Given the idea that year-round schools are an indication of an attempt to improve education and make school operations more

3,4-6

efficient, the recent trend toward public rejection of school budgets and other educational programs could be improved.

It helps to stabilize teaching staffs and create less turnover. Increased salaries if one elects to teach more--teachers have options and can choose to teach two, three or more terms usually.

Buildings open the year around utilizes the plant more effectively.

Helps to professionalize teachers in the eyes of the year-around workers.

Encourages a new way of education with experimentation of curriculum with the teacher having some voice in decisions which greatly improve efficiency.

Permits teachers to try different techniques as well as teach subjects they feel are in their area of competence.

Research and development could be conducted on a yearly basis.

Offers programs of enrichment and exploration beyond what's available during regular school year.

Creates a need for a sabbatical arrangement that can be made by teachers for travel, continuing education, by the quarter or otherwise utilization of team teaching and other staffing patterns. Fewer books are needed if state purchased.

Opportunity to proceed to higher education at an earlier age.

Helps to prevent pupil failure through:

More entry dates for beginning school, high school or college
Shorter courses where the student interest remains higher (usually student interest is high at the beginning and end of the term)
De-emphasis on grade levels
More courses available to the student
More opportunities to choose subject for student to learn what he likes best and needs most
More individualized instruction--less boredom, more flexibility
Learn-loss reduced, cutting down on necessity to "reteach"
Opportunities to make up for credit deficiencies, remedial assistance
Possibilities for experimental programs and study groups
Opportunities for student to progress at a rate commensurate with his ability and to build self-confidence

Re-education in juvenile delinquency, an elimination of the student glut on the summer job market which would be coupled with the opportunity for more students to get jobs during their vacation (non-summer) times and the opportunity for businessmen to change the work-vacation patterns of their businesses.

Effects America's society by lessening a student's dependence by freeing him for employment earlier.

Disadvantages of the Year-Round Schools

Costs due to additional salaries.

More expenses for instructional materials.

Cost of air conditioning buildings in those climates which are excessively hot/humid in the summer.

Coordination of attendance patterns for students in same family would be difficult if not impossible.

The student who wants to play football and is not attending during the fall term, plus other extra-curricular activities.

Teachers often have to prepare for different courses for each quarter, and on occasion, two different courses the same quarter. There is the problem of selecting textbooks and other classroom material to meet the needs of the varied and diversified courses being offered in each subject.

The quality of education should be the first concern. Lengthening the school year does not in itself necessarily improve it.

Difficulty in custodial care of buildings, not enough time available for thorough work on buildings.

Ten to fifteen percent of teachers do go to summer school yearly.

Heavier administrative load (and costs). More records.

Parental pressure to have students available for vacation time--difficulty scheduling so that all of family can enjoy vacations together. Increased workload--paper work, etc. No relief from this.

Students need/want other activities for their own broader perspective. May reduce camping and other recreational opportunities. Opportunity for all students to be able to accompany parents on vacations.

Students need/want to work for the necessary income.

3,4-8

What Do Teachers Think?

First, let's start with the two major teacher organizations--the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). NEA is much closer, as an organization, to accepting and promoting the idea of the year-round school.

A resolution was passed at the NEA Representative Assembly meeting in Dallas, Texas, in June, 1968, that asked the NEA to set up a committee establishing the concept of the year-round school program. An appointed committee was charged to (a) note the possible benefits of such program, (b) identify the problems involved, and (c) report its findings to the Representative Assembly, accompanied by recommendations concerning the direction the profession should take in the matter. The committee was composed of a cross-section of classroom teachers, school board members, administrators, and parents.

Following this action, the NEA President charges the Task Force on Urban Education with the responsibility for carrying out this task.

NEA believes the teachers' voice should be heard in the "Extended School Year (ESY)." If it is designed to put the emphasis on improved education, teachers must have a voice right at the beginning of the program. They will see that it works. It was established in the NEA project Time to Teach great things happened in instruction when the teachers' ideas were the basis of what was taught.

Trouble comes from the way administrators understand the word "teacher." They think and use the individual teacher rather than the organized teaching profession. Boards and administrations must meet terms and agreements of the organized teaching profession. Time already indicates all instruction items are negotiable and that negotiations are the best tool that has come to education.

All modifications of working conditions which would clearly include the development of the school calendar must be incorporated views of the organized teaching profession.

NEA believes that all matters concerning improvement of professional education are best handled through a negotiation structure.

The Association bears major responsibility for seeing that the true picture of what has happened in the year-round schools is realistically revealed to the public.

A majority of parents asked in Hayward (California) elementary felt students are better motivated in year-round school. Nearly 70 percent of the children felt the four-quarter system should be continued. Over half of them stated they didn't get bored during the short vacations.

Teachers felt their work had increased considerably because of the new organization. They felt the four-quarter program didn't interfere with their educational plans; in fact they may ask for a leave during any quarter to attend colleges in the area which are in the quarter system, allowing them greater flexibility of course selectivity.

Teachers overwhelmingly believed that the children got a better education in the program at the school and that textbooks were better utilized and AV materials. A majority of teachers felt that there was more opportunity for parent-teacher conferencing. Most of the teachers indicated that they are continually stimulated to be more creative and to try different techniques They did additional professional reading concerning the learning process of children. A summary of all other factors of the program is at a positive level with the teachers at the year-round school.

Parents felt opportunities were provided to help slow learners as well as fast learners.

Summary

Educational innovations such as restructuring the school year have such wide ramifications that problems are inevitable. NEA believes, however, that these problems are not insurmountable if the design for change is carefully selected and if adequate plans are made for the participation of parents, teachers, administration, school board, recreational, welfare, and other professional and civic leaders.

NEA submits the proposition that proper implementation of this concept is not only compatible with national goals and democratic principles, but will, in fact, greatly expedite their attainment.

Recommendations

Specific recommendations were made to the NEA for developing the year-round school concept.

1. That the NEA actively support the concept of restructuring the school year and that it stimulate the exploration, innovation, and experimentation of the program on the part of its local affiliates.

2. That the NEA provide consultants and resource persons and furnish basic information--such as location of existing programs and models for curriculum revisions--so that every school system need not start from scratch and unnecessarily research the complete field.

3, 4-10

3. That the NEA sponsor and/or influence other agencies or institutions to sponsor a series of seminars related to this concept for educators and other interested groups.

4. That the NEA explore the possibility of use of federal and institutional research funds to stimulate feasibility studies and workshops.

5. That the NEA stress the critical need for school systems to arrange for staff participation in long-range planning which might require as much as two to three years for some communities.

6. That local school systems be encouraged to design year-round programs to meet local needs. That the local association be actively involved. This would encourage school systems to carefully analyze their educational philosophies as well as their motivation for experimentation with this concept.

5

ARTESIA CA: THE ABC UNIFIED FLEXIBLE ALL-YEAR PROGRAM

Robert S. Beall

The American educational community is presently searching for alternative methods of initiating all-year school programs. In talking with fellow educators one becomes aware of semantic problems. The term, "all-year school," does not have the same meaning in all circles of education. Today there seems to be a polarization taking place which has resulted in two basic approaches regarding all-year school: (1) All-year school to permit overloading of school site; (2) extra school to provide a better education for children.

The ideal program would be one that provides attendance periods on the basis of free choice for parents and teachers. This flexibility would create an educational program that would be available to students on an all year basis; i.e., Christmas, Easter and the months of July and August. This means maximum use of facilities during the calendar year - September 1st to August 30th.

Education must change the instructional calendar year for the sake of the children. New programs represent a threat to the historical 10-month school. The backlash from the traditionalists, may it be a parent or teacher, has frustrated, or in many cases prohibited, change from taking place. Legal requirements have also limited change. Any variation from the traditional approach necessitated new permissive legislation. Finance of new approaches to education have met with minimum support from the state. For those wishing to embark on an all-year school program, these roadblocks are no longer present.

The Venn W. Furgeson all-year school plan is flexible enough to meet the needs of the traditionalists and liberals in education. Parents and teachers who need or believe that school should be 175 days between September and June with vacation times at Christmas and Easter may continue to follow the regular school year.

The Furgeson all-year school plan provides extra days of instruction on a voluntary basis. Since the school is operating for eight days at Christmas and four days during Spring vacation as well as a 43-day summer session, children can go to school as many extra days as they and their parent desire.

Parent choice is a key factor in the Furgeson Plan. Parents can take their children out of school at any time during the school year for a vacation. A maximum of three weeks of parent-choice vacation time can be taken off during the school year. These three weeks of "choice" vacation time do not include the time school is closed to all students; i.e., two weeks in June and one week in September. The Furgeson School will be teaching students forty-nine out of fifty-two weeks a year.

The schedule at Christmas, Spring vacation, July and August will be from 8:30 to 12:30 daily. This will create an on-going school environment without burning the student out with a long school day. The student can attend a minimum 175 days or a maximum 234 days during the school year, depending on family vacation plans. The procedure for student vacation during regular school days is simple. Each parent is responsible to contact the school prior to taking his child on vacation on school days between September and June. Parents fill out a form stating the days to be taken off and the approximate dates that the time will be "repaid" in order that the child attend the minimum 175 days. The attendance for Christmas, spring vacation, July and August will be kept on separate rolls and turned into the state as summer school enrollment for ADA purposes. This has been approved by the State Department of Education. Thus, the extra 55 instructional days will be self-supporting due to reimbursement by the state on a Summer School ADA basis.

How can children check in and out of school at any given time and have continuity of instruction? The Venn W. Furgeson Elementary School has been developing a continuous progress curriculum for the past five years. The curriculum levels in the areas of reading, math, language arts and science have been divided into concept levels. If a child leaves school for two weeks at concept level four in Mathematics (writing and recognition of numerals 6 - 10), when he returns he will continue working at level four, but with a different teacher and group of students. The same procedure is true for reading, language arts and science. This continuous progress curriculum, linked to a flexible team teaching schedule, is the foundation on which the all-year school program is built.

Since the Furgeson curriculum is diagnosis and prescription oriented, teachers are working in an organized classroom environment. If a teacher wishes to take vacation during the traditional school year, she will have a substitute, who is familiar with the school plan and curriculum, take over the class while she is on vacation.

Teachers sign a regular contract with the district; i.e., 175 days between September 6th and June 17th. The all-year plan provides three options to teachers. (1) If they wish to teach a traditional school year - with Christmas, Easter and ten weeks of summer, they may. (2) If the teacher wishes to receive extra pay at the summer school rate, he may work extra days during Christmas, Spring and Summer vacations. (3) Teachers may select up to thirty days of the regular school calendar for vacation and repay an equal amount of hours during the extra days school is in session. When a teacher selects vacation time during the regular school year, he receives his regular salary while on vacation. The school requires each person be bonded to insure the school of returned time or money.

Teachers who have taken vacation on regular school days make up their time on an hourly basis during the extra days that school is in session. Since the teacher receives his salary while on vacation, the district returns the hourly amount of money that would have been used to pay the teacher to the school salary budget, thus reimbursment of the cost of the substitute teacher who covered while the teacher was on vacation.

What about housing extra students? Although the Furgeson Plan is geared for extra school, educators concerned about overcrowded schools could modify the plan to meet their unique needs.

Remember the dirty word in education....double session? Parents and educators have always looked down on the double session idea since, in fact, children do not receive equal hourly instruction with the traditional 300-minute day for 175 days. The magic number is not days of instruction, rather hours of instruction during the school year.

A school in session for 175 days, 5 hours per day, will provide 875 hours of instruction. The Furgeson Plan can provide 876 hours of instruction and provide a total of seven weeks vacation of which three weeks could be taken based on parent choice. The modified Furgeson Plan would house twice the number of students on a 4-hour-a-day basis; i.e., 8:00 to 12:00 and 12:00 to 4:00 P.M. This will not only double the capacity of the school, but will provide the same amount of hours of instruction as the traditional school year. The provision for three weeks of vacation time based on the free choice of parents is still a part of this modified plan. The Furgeson Plan is so flexible that unique needs of any school can be met by modifying the basic plan.

The basic problem of the all-year school concept has been the lack of parent-child acceptance. The concept for all-year school was usually derived from educators and dictated to parents disregarding unique family needs. The parents have become very tired of schools dictating what their (parent) vacations will be and when school will be open to assist their child who may be having learning problems. Parents want a choice of when their children go to school.

People accept an idea when they have a voice in the decision-making process. The Furgeson plan has left the freedom of choice regarding when a child will be in school to the parent. The only requirement is that the minimum 175 days be attended during the year. Teachers are also given freedom of choice regarding the type of work schedule they wish to have.

The Furgeson all-year school program is child-centered. Children who need extra help can come to school for more days....the fast learner will have opportunities for rapid advancement with parental approval. The advantages to the learning environment are evident, but one "spin off" effect may take place as the program expands; i.e., vacation based on parent choice may mean skiing for a week in February at Squaw Valley or Mammouth when only a few people are using the winter facilities. Campers can begin using state parks in the middle of May and continue using them into the middle of September. The summer vacation period will be expanded to 20 weeks instead of the traditional 10. This means less crowding of recreational facilities due to the free choice factor of the all-year program. Aside from the recreational benefits, the basic goals for the Furgeson all-year school are becoming a reality - that is a flexible school year that will meet the learning needs of students and at the same time provide parents and teachers with a free choice on the educational calendar as it relates to their unique family situation.

6

MOLALLA OR: MOLALLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – A FOUR QUARTER TWELVE-MONTH SCHOOL

Sam D. Wilson

Never before in American history have people felt less sure about what's happening and where it's all taking us. Whether bell bottoms and beads or gray flannel suits, everybody knows that the world is spinning at a dizzying pace toward tomorrow.

Change is affecting the bastions of American orthodoxy--industry, government, education, and public institutions of all kinds. Women's hemlines go up and down. Automobiles change their shapes. Books and theater become more "permissive." Many of our traditional ways of thinking and behaving, of assigning people to categories, and of relating to one another, are as obsolete as movies on the Late Late Show.

John W. Gardner lays down a challenge to American education and points out the difficulty in change: "The toughest question facing us now, in my judgment, is whether we have the courage and flexibility and imagination to innovate as the times require. Let us not deceive ourselves. The old ways of doing things are not good enough. But giving up the old ways will be painful. Institutions fear change. In the face of change we all grow defensive, we all move toward protecting our particular vested interests. But the overriding vested interest of all of us is in the vitality of American education."

Molalla Elementary School District accepted the challenge to change to meet today's needs. We are an elementary district located in the suburbs of Portland and are experiencing a phenomenon familiar to other districts across the nation. Our enrollment was increasing more rapidly than our financial ability to build needed buildings--buildings that normally would stand empty three summer months.

We made the commitment to change for one purpose only--to improve the educational opportunity for the students in our district. Ours is a child-centered program. There can be no other reason for the development of a new educational change or program. The school district and the community decided to improve the educational climate for our children rather than to let it continue to deteriorate because of growing class sizes and the lack of money to construct needed classrooms and to improve the curriculum.

The plan chosen by Molalla is basically a rotating "four quarter" plan. The arrangement divides the school year into four equal quarters of twelve weeks each. Each pupil attends three quarters and vacations the fourth. All students attend school the same amount of time as under the traditional school year, but the school is in operation throughout the year, so that at any time three-fourths of the students are in school and one-fourth are on vacation. In addition, there is one week of vacation between each quarter.

This plan was chosen by the district and people of our community for several reasons: To the school administrators, it was much easier to schedule and caused less shifting of students and teachers from room to room. To the teachers it offered more options and advantages for flexible work schedules. For the community the feeling in our rural area, where students participate in harvesting of berries and beans, was that it would be better to have one group of students for the entire harvest season than to get a new group every fifteen days under the 45-15 plan.

Our four quarter plan is designed to use efficiently the school facilities and teaching staff the full year and at the same time provide a program which fits closely the varying needs of the students.

A serious school deficiency existed because of a shortage of classrooms. There was no way to improve our program without more space.

The change to a four quarter system added 10 new classrooms without a bonding and building program. The adequacy of support facilities, such as the library, cafeteria, and gymnasium was greatly improved. There is no longer a period when the school plant, one of the community's largest businesses, is idle and not making a return on the taxpayer's investment.

One-fourth less equipment is needed and bus loads and schedules were reduced, adding a bonus of safety for our students.

Heavy maintenance is on a continual basis as one would find in a fully operated industrial plant. Contrary to some belief it has proved not to cost more than the usual summer maintenance. Last summer we proved that at least in our beautiful Pacific Northwest, air conditioning is not a necessity to the year-round school. We started classes at 7:00 a.m. and turned out at 1:30 p.m. before the heat of the day. Teachers liked this schedule, and some students said because of the long afternoon to play they hardly felt like it was a school day.

In the future, when building becomes a necessity, for every three classrooms we build we will get a fourth free.

But more important and exciting is the change that was brought to the curriculum and quality of instruction with its benefits to our students.

Because of added classroom space and the lowering of class loads, significant changes in the curriculum have been made possible. Four quarter organization means flexibility and it is especially evident in the curriculum. Subjects previously squeezed into or stretched to fit the traditional two-term school year can be taught in terms of a more suitable time schedule to keep student motivation at the highest level. Curriculum was reorganized in twelve-week modules and it was possible to add thirty-eight new mini-courses (one term) ranging all the way from fun-recreational courses to advance courses in science and mathematics.

The use of summer for school opens up the greatest dimension to instruction. The four walls disappear and the classroom is any place within fifty miles of our community. Outdoor activities in science, geography, and history along with outdoor camping, 4H activities, and vacationing become a part of our curriculum.

Parent conferences are held with all parents at the end of each quarter. Report cards are a thing of the past. Personalized curriculum programs with a loss of grade placement consciousness have become a reality.

We have great respect for the student and how the new program affects his pattern of life. All students from the same family are scheduled with the same vacation period. All students can participate in team sports and group activities during the quarter they are on vacation. We have a "Call in for Education" telephone number at which a recording gives the events of the day and permits the students on vacation to participate in those that interest them.

Students have four chances to pick up work rather than only one when the job market is flooded during the summer.

Perhaps the most important advantage of our plan is the educational progress made possible by the flexibility provided by it. The lowered class size provides much more individual attention for the students. The slow learner or the pupil with classwork deficiencies caused by excessive absences, health, or other reasons, need not be held back a whole year. Since each school year's work is studied in three quarterly units, he need only obtain remedial work or repeat the work in the deficient unit. This is done by shifting him to another cycle. The traditional retention of pupils is a thing of the past.

It is also much easier to accelerate mature children with exceptional ability. The child may progress more rapidly by permitting him (her) to attend classes during the quarters that he would have otherwise been on vacation.

With a flexible vacation schedule, the children and their families may now take full advantage of recreational activities and sports which are offered in all the different seasons of the year. For example, in the winter months families may now avail themselves of the hunting season, of skiing, ice skating, and winter carnivals and sports tournaments in the North, and of warmer weather activities and trips in the South. By taking trips in different seasons of the year, such as in the spring, fall, and winter, families are able to have enjoyable vacations at substantially reduced off-season rates frequently applicable for airlines, lodging, and other tourist accommodations available in the United States and abroad. Off-season travel is more pleasant in terms of avoiding highway congestion and crowded facilities. Some businesses welcome the opportunity of spreading employee vacations over various parts of the year rather than having all employee vacations concentrated in only eight weeks or so of the summer.

Community activities such as Vacation Bible Schools and recreational programs are now year-round programs.

Any plan for change in organization must involve the instructional staff as they are the most important people in the operation of the plan.

The teachers of School District No. 35 were involved from the start in the planning of the program and the implementation of it. We feel the support of the teachers and their local educational association has been the basis for the success.

Teachers have the opportunity to work three months, six months, or nine months, or on a full-year contract. Working on a full-year contract has greatly increased the economic earning capacity of the teacher and has provided the profession with fully employed master teachers.

For those teachers who are seeking to return to school, there is the opportunity to take three-month vacations back-to-back and return to school for a six-month period with full pay. For those women seeking to raise a family, vacation periods can be arranged to coincide with the termination of their pregnancies.

It is possible for teachers to work on a full-year schedule for four years drawing a regular nine-month salary and to take a full year off the fifth year drawing full salary.

To fill the positions of those teachers on vacation, specialists from traditionally organized school districts are available. Because of their special strengths and different professional outlooks our professional staff is strengthened.

Teachers on vacation from each of the grade levels provide an excellent substitute list and no longer do we have babysitting by substitutes unfamiliar to the district.

Although possibly it is yet premature, evaluation of our program to date shows the following:

1. Complete acceptance by our community, students, and staff.

2. Tremendous increase in amount of learning and quality of our education.

3. When taking the increase in the number of our students into consideration, the cost of a twelve-month school is about the same as a traditional school year besides the fact there is no large capital outlay for new buildings.

4. Fourth, and more important we feel, it is a step toward more efficient school operation.

In conclusion, I would say we do not work at selling our program to others. Our plan has benefited our district, students, community, and staff but it possibly would not work in other areas with climate and problems different from ours. We are most happy to share our knowledge and experience with all of you in the interest of the vitality of American education.

7

LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY CA: LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL FOR CONTINUOUS EDUCATION

David D. Pascoe

On July 6, 1971, the La Mesa-Spring Valley School District activated the Year-Round School Program in one portion of the District, affecting approximately 2,000 students. July 6 was a culmination of only six months of review, study and preparation. Needless to say, that preparation was frantic, frenetic and unparralled in energy in terms of District output. Without the complete enthusiasm and cooperation of classroom teachers, the Year-Round School Program would never have come to pass.

The La Mesa and Spring Valley communities lie east, and adjacent to, the City of San Diego, California. Together with several small unincorporated areas, they cover an area of 26.5 square miles and encompass a population estimated in excess of 75,000. The La Mesa-Spring Valley School District has an enrollment of 15,000 pupils (K-8).

Like many educators throughout the nation, La Mesa-Spring Valley staff members had for several years discussed the possibility of initiating some form of year-round operation of schools. Such discussions usually centered about four-quarter plans, or extended-year plans, and were discarded as unsound on the basis of cost, questionable educational value, or lack of community readiness. With the publication in December, 1970, of a Parade Magazine article reporting the success of the Valley View, Illinois, 45-15 year-round plan, widespread community interest was generated, and a fresh look at continuous education was indicated.

When it became apparent soon after the first of the year 1971 that rapidly growing school enrollments in one area of the District could not be accommodated during the 1971-72 school year, staff members began discussing the possibility of designing a plan similar to that of the Valley View School District as a possible solution to the projected school housing shortage. Of even greater appeal was the educational advantage which such a program appeared to hold for children. Improvement of the educational program, therefore, became the overriding motivation; the shortage of classroom space provided the catalyst.

Formation of a staff pilot study committee was the first step taken. This committee was comprised of teacher representatives and principals of the five schools which were later to become participants in the plan. These schools, one junior high and the four elementary schools located within its attendance area, constituted the focal point of greatest District school housing pressure. A preliminary proposal was developed, and permission was granted by the Board of Education to approach the community with the idea of a year-round school plan as one possible solution to the projected school housing shortage.

An intensive series of thirty-four neighborhood "coffees" was initiated, in addition to five community meetings--one at each of the target schools. The "coffees" and group meetings were conducted by teams of principals and teachers. The message was essentially, "We can't stand still. We can accommodate growth in enrollment next year in one of three ways: (1) we can place some Spring Valley schools on double sessions; (2) we can transport children to available classroom space elsewhere in the District; or (3) we can generate space by entering a year-round school program. The choice is yours." Feelings against bussing and double sessions were strong, and a mandate was received from the community to proceed in further study of a year-round school plan.

At each "coffee" and community meeting, a questionnaire was distributed which sought responses to these alternatives:

Questions	Responses
In favor of year-round school	77%
Opposed, but would participate	7%
Opposed, favor bussing or double sessions	12%
Opposed, but might change mind	4%

It was determined that community acceptance of the Year-Round School Program might be enhanced if it were possible to offer an option to parents concerning their choice of plan. The rapidity with which the plan was implemented, February to July of one year, meant that some people were already committed to unalterable vacation plans and could not participate regardless of their general attitude toward year-round school.

Four elementary schools in the South Spring Valley area contribute children to the junior high school. It was determined, through an analysis of new housing construction, rate-of-growth projections, etc., that by placing the junior high school and two of the four elementary schools on the plan, anticipated growth could be accommodated. By doing so, the two remaining schools could continue on a traditional calendar and be teamed with the year-round schools, thus providing an option to parents. As it developed, more children entered year-round school than were lost.

Each parent was mailed an attendance calendar and a parent response card on which they were asked to indicate if they wished to enroll their children in the Year-Round School Program or preferred to enroll them in an adjacent school which would continue on a nine-month program. Transportation would be provided by the District to the school of their choice. Responses were consistent with the original reactions expressed by the community, with only 8% of those residing in year-round school attendance areas electing to send their children to nine-month schools.

The reverse choice was also offered to parents of children residing in the attendance areas of teamed nine-month schools. Approximately 14% chose this option. Eighty-eight percent elected to stay in their regular school of attendance regardless of the program.

On July 6, 1971, one-fourth of the children in two elementary schools and one junior high school began their first school year under the Year-Round School Program. On July 26, another one-fourth joined their classmates. The third group entered on August 16, and the plan was fully operational. On September 7, one week before most California school children were due to return to school, the first group of year-round school children began a three-week vacation, and the fourth group started its school year.

Parents, principals, and teachers reported the "smoothest" school opening in their memories. The children were there with their new shoes and lunch pails, and no more than the usual percentage of late entries was noted. Attitudes of children, parents, and teachers toward reentering school after a short vacation period appeared to be positive.

The duration of the school year for children is not extended by this plan. They attend school 177 days - the same as children in La Mesa-Spring Valley schools which are not on the plan. Their school year is simply distributed more broadly across the calendar year than is the case in traditionally organized schools. At any given time, three-fourths of the children are attending school while one-fourth are on vacation.

Classroom teachers at the elementary level in the plan are "tracked" with their pupils. That is, when the children go on vacation, the teacher also leaves. When they return for their next nine-week attendance period, they are assigned the same teacher, but return to a different classroom. It is intended that teachers will remain with a group through four nine-week blocks which would be equivalent to a traditional school year. This general rule is subject to modification at the junior high school level where teachers and groups of children rotate more frequently, depending upon the nature of the course offering.

The traditional summer school program has been redesigned to articulate with the Year-Round School Program. Intersession courses are offered continuously during all of the three-week vacation periods. Intersession courses are staffed either by teachers from within the District who are on vacation, or by teachers hired on a limited contract from outside the District. Intersession teachers are paid the same daily rate as summer school teachers.

Available classroom housing space is generated, under the plan, through continuous use of existing school facilities. Pupils returning from vacation move into classrooms vacated by those just leaving for a vacation period. Thus, when operating at full capacity, three schools can house the equivalent of four school populations. Classrooms are changed every nine weeks, but children remain with their teacher and with the group to which they were originally assigned.

The La Mesa-Spring Valley Year-Round School Program was specifically designed for less-than-saturation utilization of school plants. In each school on the plan, one or two "open rooms" are retained to allow for intersession and recreation use, and for special-interest centers. This available space may also accommodate a schedule of major maintenance since classes may be temporarily relocated while classrooms are refurbished.

Extending the Year-Round School Program through the junior high school level is another feature of the La Mesa-Spring Valley plan. Although considerable creative effort was required in organizing basic and exploratory courses, accommodating performing music groups, staffing, and student scheduling, no problems were encountered which have not been solved.

The target school, La Presa Junior High School, is a departmentalized seventh- and eighth-grade school of approximately 700 students, presently built to 50% of its ultimate size. It is a flexible open-space plant and is fully climate-controlled. La Presa Junior High uses differentiated staffing and team-teaching which have also been facilitated by the year-round schedule. Essentially four smaller schools-within-a-school were formed.

The two elementary schools operating a Year-Round School Program are of the self-contained classroom variety. One is climate-controlled, one is not. Both have small, but well-stocked media centers staffed with a half-time librarian and a full-time library aide. Each school serves from 750 to 850 pupils in grades kindergarten through six.

As in the case of the junior high school, the Year-Round School Program requires the organization of four small schools-within-a-school. Enrollment in each of the four attendance groups is approximately 190 children distributed through the grades. Combination classes are the rule, although some single-grade classes are formed when enrollment at a single grade level is sufficient.

The program is still too new to have been evaluated. Testing is being conducted by the District with parent, student and staff surveys to be conducted by San Diego State College and the California Teachers Association Research Bureau. Future schedules and expansion will be determined by the results of these evaluations.

9

THERE'S NO MYSTERY, OR MISERY, IN SCHEDULING YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

Eugene Hayes

Westinghouse Learning Corporation (WLC) was asked to help the administrative team at Champlain Valley Union High School (Vermont) to schedule its 45-15 Plan of the extended school year. WLC's offices at Waltham, Massachusetts, accepted the challenge. Using its computer-load program (N1), with a House Plan feature, the school's Master Schedule was constructed and students loaded against this Schedule.

Briefly, the scheduling procedures are as follows:

1. Pupil Course Requests (PCRs) were placed on file at WLC-Waltham in the school's Pupil Master File (PMF). This file contained a House Code for each student corresponding to each of the four houses that the school organized. At the school, each 'house' corresponded to a particular calendar that students in the house would follow throughout the school year. The calendar for any given house resulted from various combinations of 15 day periods designed to permit three of the four houses to be in the building at any one time.

2. The PCR's were analyzed both in terms of the total school population and the population of each house. The Master Schedule was constructed in such a way as to permit paralleling the placement of courses in the Master Schedule thereby reducing the probabilities of conflicts caused by singleton or doubleton courses.

3. Where a particular 'house' has too few students requesting a course, the school must decide whether to drop the course or combine the students with those of another house. While technically a minor problem, combining students from two or more houses results in a flow of students in and out of the class every 15 days; the ultimate consequence is that teachers must individualize their instructional design - a difficult task if not anticipated early enough.

4. Teacher-assignments were made with an eye to departmental coverage, first, and individual assignments, second. This permitted opportunities to free teachers 25% of the year or hire part-time teachers to meet quarter and semester course staffing demands not met by the full-time staff.

5. Room assignments were made on the basis of continual room utilization across the full twelve months. One result is that some teachers did not

find themselves in a position to conduct their classes in the same rooms throughout the year.

6. The computer sorts the Master Schedule by its complexity (assuming the school has not further weighted specific courses by assigning a priority other than a mid-weight of 5), ordering all singletons before doubletons before tripletons, etc. It then sorts all students in each grade, grade by grade, in terms of this complexity so that students requesting courses that are singletons will be scheduled before those requesting doubletons, etc. The result is that the students who are more difficult to schedule are loaded against the Master Schedule first, when the most seats exist. Seniors are loaded before Juniors before Sophomores before Freshmen.

7. Changes in a student's schedule, once the year has begun, are handled either at the school or via a re-printing computer run at WLC.

Looking beyond the initial scheduling year, it is possible to re-schedule only part of the student body at one time by using a variation of the "college type" or "arena" scheduling approach. Here, existing classes are pre-recorded and assigned in the Master Schedule and students being re-scheduled are restricted to new classes only. Decks of cards are produced for each course in the quantity desired for optimum class size and students requesting each course are given a course card from these decks. Once all requests have been filled and changes made, each student's deck of cards is loaded onto the computer, analyzed for possible conflicts, and schedules and class lists printed.

The costs of computer service for initially scheduling the 45-15 Plan are not prohibitive; in fact, they are below $2.00 per student depending on the type of service and optional reports the school may request. Re-scheduling every quarter or semester need not increase the costs very much, either, provided the school merely modifies its existing Master Schedule.

10

THE ELECTIVE QUARTER PLAN

Richard VanHoose

"Free" public education has been haunted for a long time by the ghost of inadequate funding. Every professional educator is familiar with complaints that the school dollar ought to be spent more effectively. Now that traditional sources of funds for schools are being challenged from New Jersey to California, it is more urgent than ever that school systems make wise use of their present resources.

Over the years in Jefferson County, Kentucky we have asked ourselves what we could do to improve our program of education without making improvement totally dependent upon increased funding. Each year for many years we have budgeted thousands of dollars for curriculum revision and new courses of study. Yet over the years we have not been completely satisfied that the results justified our investment.

In order to improve curriculum at the high school level in particular, and in response to repeated criticisms that school facilities were wasted three months each year, we made a thorough investigation of a restructured school calendar. The waste of human resources during the summer months was of even greater concern than idle buildings, though an average enrollment increase of about 4, 000 pupils each year for the past 20 years has demanded that we make the fullest possible use of our buildings.

An ad hoc Citizens Advisory Committee on year-round school was appointed in 1968. After serious study of a number of plans, the quarter plan was recommended by this committee as the most feasible approach. Our staff agreed that this type of reorganization was not only the most feasible, but would provide the opportunity to write new courses and update others into 60 day units of instruction. Curriculum revision on a large scale could make our courses relevant, current and meaningful.

By unanimous vote in May of 1970, the Jefferson County Board of Education directed the staff to proceed with implementation of the Elective Quarter Plan. The following objectives were considered:

1. To offer greater educational opportunities for students, and to reduce school failures through
    a. flexible scheduling
    b. curriculum improvement and enrichment
    c. more comprehensive program of study
    d. freedom of course selection
    e. choice of vacation quarter
2. To provide students with a better chance to stay on schedule if makeup work is needed
3. To open the door to year-round employment for teachers
4. To utilize present school facilities more fully
5. To reduce future building needs

The Elective Quarter Plan divides the conventional school year into three parts and adds a summer quarter. Each quarter contains 58, 59 or 60 days of instruction. A pupil who attends three quarters fulfills the Kentucky requirement of a minimum 175 days of instruction.

Most public school students now spend twelve years in school, a period of time equal to 24 quarters in grades 1-8 and 12 quarters in high school. Cost to the taxpayer for a child's education will be the same whether a student completes 36 quarters in twelve years or eleven years.

Under the Elective Quarter Plan pupils will gain by having an updated curriculum with varied course offerings and a choice of vacation time. The taxpayer will gain because classroom space and seats will not be needed for those who vacation during one of the conventional quarters. Students who accelerate will make space available earlier for others. These two factors can reduce appreciably the need for classroom space.

Our students were polled on their choice of quarters for the school year beginning in September, 1972. Over 88,000 responded. Of these, 2,198 (or 2%) wish to attend class in the summer and vacation at some other time of year. When we added those who want to attend all four quarters, we came up with a figure of 6,167 (or 7%) who want to attend a summer quarter. This will reduce our classroom needs for 1972-73 by about 25 rooms. Our building program cannot be reduced by 25 classrooms immediately, but these facts give some idea of the potential for saving on capital outlay.

Most pupils who complete 24 quarters will be ready to enter high school. Those retained will be entitled to additional quarters, just as they have always been, until they are ready for the ninth grade. We expect to reduce the number of pupils who must repeat work.

High school students will receive one point for each 60 day unit of work completed, earning three points in English, for example, for three quarters of work. Three points equal one Carnegie unit. High school course numbers and titles resemble college course designations, with one hundred courses primarily for freshmen, two hundred courses for sophomores, and so on. Many courses are non-sequential, allowing for great flexibility in scheduling.

It is our conviction that the Elective Quarter Plan will not cost any more in the long run, and that as the community takes full advantage of the opportunity for flexible vacation schedules we can realize considerable saving in construction costs. The plan will require some initial outlay. We consider this an investment which will pay dividends many times over in future savings and in demonstrated advantages which other school systems can utilize.

On the basis of current figures, the 4,000 students who want to attend a fourth quarter next year would cost the state about $412,000. Cost to our board of education for these students would be about $504,000. The U. S. Office of Education is already providing support in the amount of $500,000 for curriculum revision over a three-year period. We are not seeking adjustments in Kentucky's Minimum Foundation Law at this time, but for provision by the state that will not affect the allotment to other school districts. If the Elective Quarter Plan lives up to its promise, Minimum Foundation funds can be adjusted in 1974 to allow other state systems to adopt the schedule.

Without state aid for the summer quarter, a vital link in the Elective Quarter Plan will be weakened. Conventional summer school supported by tuition fees, our present approach to summer classes, will not serve the purpose. We need a tuition-free summer quarter for students who vacation another quarter in the year, for those who need to make up work, and for those who wish to accelerate. The success of our plan will reduce the number of students who now must repeat an entire year because of failure in one or two subjects.

Free public education is indeed a costly business. Society's demands and expectations make it so. The Elective Quarter Plan's potential justifies the comparatively small cost of initiating the program. We welcome the opportunity to share our finds with other school systems.

11

HAYWARD CA: PARK 4-QUARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Raymond G. Arveson

Introduction

Hayward is a community of nearly 150,000 population in the East Bay of the San Francisco Bay Area. It is a suburban middle socio-economic community that is essentially a "bedroom community." Most of the people who live in Hayward work in industries and service occupations outside the Hayward area.

Park Elementary School is a very average elementary school in the Hayward Unified School District. It has a population of between 450 and 475 students and is located in the center of the Hayward School District.

History of Four-Quarter Elementary Project

The idea for an all-year-round or four-quarter elementary school originated with two elementary school principals, Mr. Barney Moura and Dr. Dan Foster. They presented the idea to the district for consideration. The district decided it was worthy of study and sought funds to conduct a feasibility study. During the summer of 1967, the district received an ESEA Title III grant of $31,403 for the purpose of conducting a feasibility study during the period from September 1, 1967, through January 31, 1969. The district later received a continuation grant of $29,538 to cover the period of February 1, 1969, to August 31, 1969.

The feasibility study consisted of independent staff planning, curriculum development and inservice education. A number of consultants were used during this time including Dr. Madeline Hunter, Director of the University Elementary School at UCLA.

Goals

The purposes for an all-year-round school program that all students would attend all year around were developed and carefully considered and include:

1. A longer instructional year to provide more time for children's learning.

2. A longer school year would provide additional time to include more curricular offerings for elementary students.

3. Shorter vacation periods at more frequent intervals would reduce the loss of learning that occurs during the traditionally long summer vacation.

4. The more frequent vacations would tend to alleviate both student and teacher fatigue.

5. The greater amount of time would provide opportunity for flexibility including the opportunity for more in-depth instruction.

6. The time between quarters would provide teachers with an opportunity to plan together for curricular development and instructional procedures.

7. The time between quarters provides the opportunity for teachers to have meaningful parent-teacher conferences and thus provide closer communication between the home and the school.

8. The quarter system was correlated with the quarter system of the State College to provide the opportunity for teachers to take leaves for advanced study.

9. The more frequent shorter vacation provides opportunities for a variety of vacation schedules and plans.

10. Provides all-year-round use of school facilities.

11. Provides better utilization of audio-visual and other instructional materials and resources.

12. Provides additional time for both remedial and enrichment instruction.

Legislation

Because the school year for Park School would differ from the school year of the other elementary schools in the district, it was necessary to seek legislative approval for the experimental all-year-round school. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, of the 13th District in Hayward, introduced Assembly Bill 1971 that was passed by the California State Legislature and signed into law by the Governor on August 6, 1968. AB 1971 provided legislative entitlement for the experiment to continue for a two-year period. In 1970, Assemblyman Bee introduced AB 1691 to allow for an additional five years of operation. This bill received unanimous approval of the legislature and was signed into law permitting the all-year-round program to continue through the 1974-75 school year.

Calendar

The school year consists of four quarters of approximately 50 days each with three weeks between quarters. One week of each break is devoted to parent conferences, teacher inservice education and teacher planning. Teachers then have two weeks vacation between quarters. The district's Christmas and Spring vacations coincide with the three-week-quarter breaks.

Staffing

When the feasibility study began and prior to the implementation of the program, teachers were given the option of remaining at Park School or transferring to another elementary school in the district. Assignment at Park School is always on a voluntary basis since teachers and other staff members work on al all-year-round basis.

Financing the Project

Title III funds provided money for inservice education for curricular development and for some special instructional materials. The Title III funds also funded an independent evaluation that was conducted by General Behavioral Systems, Incorporated.

The legislative entitlement provided that additional state apportionment funds could accrue to the district for the additional days that school was in session. This provides the major share of the additional funding that is needed for teaching, administrative and staff salaries that are prorated for the additional number of work days.

Future of Program

The initial evaluation of the program was generally positive, but it was definitely the thinking of the staff that the program should be continued on an experimental basis for an additional length of time to provide a more valid basis for decision about the future of the program. Reports were made on the program to the State Board of Education and to the Legislature. The new legislation provides for additional reports to the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Legislature. On the basis of future evaluation and these reports, decisions will be made for continuing and/or extending the program to other schools, both within and outside the district.

12

VALLEY VIEW IL: THE VALLEY VIEW 45-15 CONTINUOUS SCHOOL YEAR PLAN

William Rogge

The "45-15 Plan," so well known as one model of a year-round school operation, is very simple in format. Pupils are divided into four groups. Each group goes to school for 45 days and then has a vacation, 15 school days long. A complete cycle is 60 school days. However, each successive group starts 15 days after the preceding group. Thus, only three-fourths of the students are in school at any one time. The cycle is repeated four times a year, right through the traditional summer vacation.

However, while the format is simple, the details for implementation are many. The procedures must be worked out to answer these questions: (1) Which families are on which cycle or "tracks;" (2) Do teachers work 180, 240, or some other number of days each year; (3) Are there any legal problems; (4) Do maintenance people work on a revised schedule; (5) What will be done with the space gained by the Plan; (6) How is the community support to be obtained; (7) How much are administrator contracts to be lengthened; (8) What community programs must change to handle a smaller group of children on vacation, but on vacation all year-round?

The experience of the Valley View School District shows how each of these can be worked out. Other school districts might use other approaches, but the Valley View experience proves that a year-round school operation is practical and possible.

In the summer of 1970, over 6600 Valley View School District 96 students abandoned their summer vacations and went back to the classroom in what has turned out to be an entirely innovative concept of year-round school. After over a year and one-half of operation, the Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan can be rightly considered a "Way of Life" in District 96, so much so that the District is now more concerned with other programs - open concept, unit district formation, etc.

But this "success" did not just happen. It was a result of a team effort between Administration, Board of Education, Teachers, Students, and Community. In my presentation, I will discuss the part of the Administration in this team effort. But first, a little background is in order.

Calendar revision in Valley View School District 96 was dictated solely by economic necessity. An unbelievable geometric progression of enrollments - from 219 in 1958, to 1800 in 1962, to 3750 in 1966, and to 6650 in 1970 -

had exhausted the District of its bonding power. The voters of the district never once turned down an educational rate increase or a bond referendum to provide the needed schools over that 12-year period, but finally the statutory limit on bonded indebtedness was reached. And then in 1968, the Illinois General Assembly mandated kindergarten in all public schools in the State by 1970. This meant an addition of 800 kindergartners, plus the normal yearly growth of over 600 students, to an already overcrowded school system which was willing, but legally unable, to provide additional facilities.

Fortunately, the Administration and the Board of Education were aware of the magnitude of the coming problem early in 1968. Only three possible alternatives were available:

(1) To place a large part of District 96 on double shifts.

(2) To increase the size of classes to 40 or 50 students.

(3) To consider school calendar reform.

The first two alternatives were considered educationally inferior both by the administration and by the community, while school calendar reform was an unknown quantity.

The administration embarked on an intensive study of the voluminous published literature available on year-round calendar plans. Review of the available bibliography revealed one salient fact. Most commentators were concerned, not with making new calendar programs work, but with arming administrators and teachers with objections and arguments to combat the pressures for year-round schools. (These pressures originated primarily with businessmen and trade and taxpayers' organizations who wanted to adopt what seemed to be, on the surface, an entirely reasonable and workable business proposition.) Little practical information existed.

In studying the feasibility of a year-round calendar plan, the administration estimated that some form of calendar revision could be effected in three years. The Board of Education, however, faced the reality of the housing crisis brought on by the pending arrival in September, 1970, of a continuing on rush of kindergarten students. Brushing aside the caution of the administration, the Board members voted on August 15, 1968, that a year-round plan must be implemented by the 1970-71 school year when the kindergarteners would arrive.

With the two-year deadline a reality, the Valley View administrators faced the task of researching, developing, and implementing a viable and acceptable plan that would meet the needs of the student body and would also win the acceptance and cooperation of the faculty and the community. The administration's research made abundantly clear that none of the dozens of plans that had been proposed previously would be workable in the Valley View District, or would be acceptable today in any other school system.

It was necessary for the administration to cast away all previous concepts of year-round school programs, and to develop a workable calendar of its own. In less than 60 days of "cut and fit" experimentation with theoretical calendars, the administration evolved the "Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan."

Only 19 months remained to put this paper "Plan" into actual operation, a very short time considering the magnitude of the problems yet to be solved. It was necessary to work out the technicalities of scheduling, school census, transportation, air conditioning, curriculum adjustment, and teacher negotiations. These problems were in addition to passing in two sessions of the Illinois Legislature, needed changes in the law to make the 45-15 Plan legal (it was not). But perhaps the most important task facing the Administration and Board over this 19-month period was to take the public into its confidence, keeping everyone informed as each step was taken leading to that first day of year-round school on June 30, 1970.

Fortunately, our administrative personnel looked upon all of these problems as challenges to be met and not as excuses for possible failure. Although life during these 19 months seemed like one perpetual crisis, nevertheless, the mood was always one of confidence and expectation. The fact that the Illinois Governor signed the bill making 45-15 legal in the state only the day before classes actually began on June 30, 1970, is evidence of this confidence amid crisis.

So don't let your school administration scare you off. Year-round school will mean much work and effort on their part. It is certainly "easier" for them to accept double sessions or overcrowding than to implement year-round school; thus, there might be the tendency to "talk down" any such idea. Fortunately in our district, we are blessed with an administration that is not afraid of change, when change is necessary, or of hard work.

But how do the teachers like the 45-15 Plan? There are as many different answers to that question as there are teachers in our district. However, the overwhelming majority of teachers endorse and support the plan. There are several reasons for this.

First of all, the 45-15 Plan offered a solution to our housing problem. To the staff this plan offered a new, challenging, and feasible alternative in contrast to the traditional solutions of double shifts, sliding schedules, large classes, portable classrooms and other adjustments that have been made to solve similar problems.

The plan offers to the staff the opportunity to be employed year round and at the same time enjoy increased earning power. We no longer are part-time professionals, but rather employed year round in the profession we have chosen for our life work.

Under this plan there are many different contracts that are available to the teacher. This is an obvious advantage. The teacher can now come closer to choosing a contract which best meets his needs. The teacher no longer has to be limited to that single choice of every traditional school calendar.

Although it is often forgotten, teachers are parents and taxpayers also. Most agree that it is a waste of the taxpayers money to have the schools sit idle during the summer months. They agree with the basic philosophy of keeping the schools open year round.

There may be a slight attitudinal change in the students. They have something to look forward to more often. Students are in school a shorter period of time before they receive a vacation. They are not separated from the classroom for extended periods of time as they are on a traditional plan. Teachers and students are spending less time in review. There is little or no adjustement period for students if they have been away from school for only three weeks.

Hinesburg VT: 45-15 MULTIPLE ACCESS CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR

13

Johannes S. Olsen
Lucien E. Lambert
Paul D. Rice
Arthur H. Scott

MULTIPLE ACCESS AND ADMINISTRATION

It is important to note that year-round education is a concept, not a specific method of operation. Each school district involved in developing or implementing a year-round concept has done so in its own unique way, based on its particular needs, strengths, and areas of weakness.

While the original concept of year-round education was concerned primarily with space savings and economy, it is now viewed as the most desirable "next step" in the program evolution toward an open-access curriculum. Indeed, at Champlain Valley Union High School, the most accurate term for the concept is "The Multiple Access Curriculum and Calendar."

What is a multiple access calendar? It is a calendar that allows a student to select the time that he will attend school. The student can choose from a wide perimeter, consisting of the traditional school year to selecting which 175 days a year he will be in attendance in school.

The 1972-73 academic year will consist of eleven quarters, each nine-weeks in duration. Students may attend any four quarters (not overlapping) to meet our state's minimum requirements for attendance.

The curriculum is characterized by continuous progress courses; nine-week and semester courses; independent study; open laboratories; Individualized Student-Directed Activities (ISDA); Do Unto Others (DUO , a program in which students have the opportunity to learn by serving in the community and receive academic credit for the experience); three- and five-year graduation; post-graduate study opportunities; differentiated staffing; alternative staffing; home study; resource center for each department; and the like.

We have worked to break out of the "chalk-and-talk" teacher and "lock-step" learning traditions. We have worked to become extremely flexible and individualized. We now have the ability in numerous program areas to improve the program through multiple access courses.

The multiple access curriculum and calendar is more than an attempt to manipulate time and space over 240 days instead of 180.

The primary function of our program has been an emphasis on the improvement of educational program. The development and implementation of the previously mentioned curriculum, along with changes in teaching methodology, have definitely humanized and improved the educational program at Champlain Valley Union.

MULTIPLE ACCESS CURRICULUM

Whether a school is contemplating an extended or a continuous school year, it is a moot point as to whether the calendar itself will have any effect on the curriculum. This is purely a local matter and a school that has had a mandated and sequential program in a traditional setting can undoubtedly continue this philosophy under such concepts as 45-15. However, there is no question that to develop a calendar without at the same time reexamining the accessibility of the curriculum to students places some severe restrictions on when the curriculum is accessible to students. Consequently, Champlain Valley Union High School has decided that a multiple access calendar is the only viable answer to flexibility, since if students do not have multiple entry options into a large number of courses, scheduling can become a morass.

With sufficient enrollment in certain courses, they can continue to be offered as they are presently. However, if this is not possible because of low enrollment, then it becomes necessary to combine students from two or more groups who will not always be in school at the same time. This obviously necessitates a degree of flexibility not ordinarily available if a course is to be offered. It requires that a teacher have the ability to work in a multiple-class situation and makes a reality such nostrums as individualized instruction and resource centers. It demands that the curriculum be spelled out in behavioral terms or that some other method of reasonable planning occur if there is not to be a great deal of void or duplication in offerings as students flow in and out of sections during the course of the year. In such areas as shorthand and foreign languages the use of multi-channel cassette consoles has become mandatory since students are at different points of learning. If there is a knowledge failure of the continuous school year, some schools unfortunately could assess the failure as a result of calendar rather than inflexible operation.

Alvin Toffler in Future Shock states that modularization is an attempt to liberate man from his surroundings. He might have also added that modularization appears as an attempt to liberate man. Our statements in the previous paragraphs allude to this. It is our basic assumption that one attempt at modularization is the one-hundred twenty some odd calendar options that can eventually be accessible to our students and a plethora of curricular offerings available by fragmenting courses into nine-week segments. Not only does it simplify the schedulers' task in terms of student, teacher and room availability, but it helps to put to rest the notion, largely unfounded, that courses must be sequential.

For example, we are well on our way in abandoning courses such as earth science, biology, chemistry, etc., as year long courses. We shall offer, instead, seven or eight options in each of these areas and schedule on demand quarter courses. In mathematics, for those students willing and able to, we are offering continuous progress courses. We also have many courses that are available for independent study. We make the myth of modular-flexible scheduling work internally by having open laboratories in science and open access in art, along with resource centers for every department. It is our contention that because of these notions that we already practice, we will not have a knowledge failure in dealing with multiple access.

The caution offered here, then, is that schools who are contemplating continuous school years (more so than those who will merely extend them) must seriously assess their present method of curriculum offerings and among the welter of considerations they must examine is their view of whether learning, as Wilson states, is "a string of beads" or "a bunch of grapes". If they do not ascribe to the latter, then they will discover that changing calendars is neither cheaper nor edifying educationally.

COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS

It is fair to state that the community comprising the Champlain Valley Union High School District expects quality program, reasonable expenditures, and critical appraisal of the program and operation.

The school opened in the fall of 1964 with a total enrollment of 450 students, grades 9-12. By 1965 the Board of School Directors recognized the need for expansion, particularly in core facilities. Two bond issues offered in the spring of 1968 failed. Both prior to and following the bond issue presentations, numerous study groups provided recommendations, consultants were brought in, and faculty and administrative solutions were suggested. The school enrollment during this time increased to nearly 1,000 students in a building of 750 capacity.

An Ad Hoc Committee was established by the Board in the spring of 1970 and charged with finding a solution to the school's space problem. The Committee discovered 45-15 in the literature and studied the concept further because it seemed to meet the several criteria set by the Committee as necessary for any adequate long-range solution to our problems. In September of 1970, the Board of School Directors charged the Committee to provide the community with information concerning the 45-15 concept and charged the administration to work toward developing the necessary skills, administrative and teaching, to obtain a clear indication as to our ability to actually implement 45-15. The Ad Hoc Committee was instructed to report back to the Board in November with a final recommendation concerning implementation.

Today, through the benefit of hindsight, we can much better appreciate the mammoth undertaking we set for ourselves. There was no doubt in our minds that we possessed the ability to effectively implement the 45-15 program; time and an extremely competent faculty have shown this to be true. What proved extremely difficult, however, and I am sure sounded often like sheer uncertainty, was to convincingly explain to the public a concept, the details of which were still being worked out by the administration and faculty.

One case in point was the area of transportation, in which an initial solution to the transportation problem was presented to the public and then revised because we found a much more desirable solution. Such circumstances had an unsettling effect on the community and gave support to the idea that more time was needed to fully develop the concept.

We erred in stating that 45-15 was simply a revision in calendar. The point we were trying to make was that merely implementing a 45-15 calendar accomplished nothing in terms of program, curriculum, and the like. We were attempting to emphasize that it was only with adoption of a 45-15 calendar AND the implementation of a highly desirable program, taking advantage of all the new opportunities now available, that the 45-15 concept was an extremely desirable solution to our particular problem. The community and the school were seeking the same goals - excellent program and maximum flexibility - but we did not understand each other sufficiently.

Our district is not a homogeneous community economically, socially or educationally. It is highly suburban in some respects, extremely rural in others. Because of this, we all felt that the school needed to provide the range of programs and calendar flexibility necessary to meet the needs of all its constituents. The best solution is not the calendar utilized by schools throughout the nation which, almost without exception, is fixed, rigid, and mandatory, and which is without basis either educationally or in terms of personal or family convenience. 45-15, too, in those districts in which it has been implemented, is as rigid and mandatory as any traditional calendar. A number of persons in our community visited districts in which 45-15 had been implemented at the elementary level and were unable to visualize 45-15 as a flexible calendar; indeed, they were told that implementation of 45-15 at the high school level was a number of years off (with such friends, who needs enemies!).

As a result of the controversy which followed, not the least of which concerned the matter of per diem for teachers, it was decided to continue with a traditional school year during 1971-72. At the same time the Board offered all members of the community the opportunity to participate with Board members, faculty, and students in discussions of the problems facing C. V. U. They were also offered the opportunity to make recommendations to the Board of School Directors regarding solutions.

Innumerable hours of effort were devoted to the school for a period of several months by the many persons serving on the numerous committees and sub-committees. There were clear signs of a common spirit from the beginning. It was obvious that everyone serving on the committees, virtually without exception, was proud of the Champlain Valley Union High School and was very jealous to safeguard its program and to further its potential. The result was a very excellent and extensive report to the Board. The greatest emphasis was on the desired flexibility of program and calendar.

It is for this reason that the Board has adopted for the coming school year a multiple access curriculum and calendar. It does not abolish the traditional school year for those who like that calendar best but does open up fantastic new opportunities for those who desire or require additional flexibility. It emphasizes quality curricular programs and capitalizes on the capabilities of an outstanding faculty and resourceful community.

As of this writing, no adverse comments have been received from the community regarding next year's program and calendar, in marked contrast to our experience of last year.

Our program and calendar are not a panacea, but they give us the freedom to work more effectively toward our goals. The process we have experienced has also renewed our conviction that we can work together in a very productive way and in a common interest to resolve our problems.

THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN MULTIPLE ACCESS CURRICULUM

In order to consider the implementation of a Multiple Access Curriculum, one must never underplay the role of the faculty in planning and developing the program, if, for no other reason, than that the success or failure of such a program will ultimately be in their hands.

Faculty must be involved at the decision-making level. They must be given the opportunity to provide input, and they must be ready to react and to accept this responsibility which will be new for many of them. There are various forms this input can take but eventually they (and only they) will have to answer questions concerning the specific curriculum they are involved with in their work. Such questions as the following will have to be answered:

1. What form will your course take? (Continuous Progress, 36 weeks, 18 weeks, 9 weeks or a different form.)

2. When and where must your course be offered? (Anytime, at a particular time of year, or in a particular place.)

3. When can students start this course? (Anytime, at the beginning only, or at the beginning of each quarter it is offered.)

4. Can a student enter and leave a course freely?

5. Can this course be made more flexible?

6. What kinds of planning time do you need to accomplish number 5 if your answer is yes?

This last one is an important key, since it is conceivable that many courses might adapt to a more flexible approach. Time and funds must be made available for the faculty to plan these changes.

A second role of the faculty is again one of decision-making, but one of a more personal nature. TO EFFECTIVELY PLAY MY ROLE IN THIS PROGRAM, WHEN DO OR CAN I PLAN TO TEACH?

A selection of Teacher Options regarding calendar must be considered. If the basic contract of a teacher is 185 days and school will be open 200 or more days, the individual staff member will have to decide when he will be teaching. Factors other than the obvious ones of potential teacher fatigue and desire to attend school for professional advancement are involved. Of particular importance are the courses students elect and the calendar options students elect. Although it is important that the teacher have these options prior to schedule making, a final model of teacher options is complete only when the three factors of course selection, student calendar options, and teacher time options are meshed into a workable schedule.

The third factor for the faculty, and a key one, is the matter of salary. With a basic contract period of 185 days, any excess number of days MUST be on a per diem basis, in order to consider implementation with any potential for success. An alternative or some form of paying on performance for the "basic" contract may be considered but once a base number of days is decided upon, per diem for additional days is necessary. It should also be noted that additional days may not be entirely teaching days but could and should involve curriculum development and planning time as well. The impact of this on negotiations is obvious and it would be conjecture to expand on this phase of the work.

In summary, these factors are keys to faculty involvement in a Multiple Access Curriculum:

1. Optional contracts for teachers and per diem pay.

2. The teacher must have the primary responsibility and option of designing the nature of the course.

3. The teacher assumes the responsibility to work with planning, preparing, and creating an understanding of his program, in his area of study.

4. An opportunity should be provided for faculty and student involvement in the decision-making process.

5. Time and funds must be available in various forms in order to plan and work for implementation and continuing development of the program.

One factor which has not been brought into this is the ultimate goal behind such faculty involvement in the planning and implementing of the program. This is the student. By having the type of involvement suggested, the climate in the school, the classrooms, and in the community benefits the student by providing a program in which those who work with it, believe in it.

14

NO NEWS ISN'T GOOD NEWS: DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

James Burch

There is a four-point process which BBDO uses in making its advertising communications effective. They are principles which are sound, not only for advertising, but for all kinds of communication.

1. Know Your Prime Prospect - Who is it you want to reach? 17% of the people buy 79% of the instant coffee, 14% buy 90% of all scotch, 25% buy 100% of all airline tickets. We call them "heavy users." If you're trying to change an image, who are the people most vocal in their expression of the wrong image? The more specific you can be in defining exactly who that person is, the more effective your communications will be. Do they tend to be a certain age, sex, income, political view, educational level, etc.? This will help decide the best way to reach them.

2. Know Your Prime Prospect's Problem - The best way to do this is to get a group of them together to talk about the subject, whether it's instant coffee, scotch, airlines, or year-round education. Find out as clearly as possible what the problems are; i.e., "the airlines take too long to deliver my baggage," "year-round education means I can't take my family on vacation during the summer," etc. You may end up with a list of problems, but they are strong clues to the needs of your prime prospect.

3. Know Your Product - Having done your homework on #1 and #2, now you can examine what it is you have to "sell" and see if it solves the prime prospect's problems. The difference here is that instead of discovering something swell about your product or service and then telling people about it (they may not be interested!), you talk about your product or service in terms of what it can do to help resolve their concerns or solve their problems.

4. Break the Boredom Barrier - Now that you know what to say and who to say it to, you've got to find a way to make an impression...to get noticed...to get through that quarter inch of bone in the front of people's heads that separates them from everything else. Keep it simple, say it straight, but above everything else make sure it isn't dull or boring. Why make it easy for people to ignore you?

15

PREPARING TEACHERS FOR ALL SEASONS

Don E. Glines

Introduction

I have chosen to expand my originally assigned topic, "Preparing Teachers For All Seasons," into Alternative Public Schools and Colleges for All Seasons. I include public not to discriminate against private schools; they need to provide the same types of philosophies. However, the public schools and colleges must dramatically retool, for they are the supposedly free, required or at the college level, voluntary low-tuition institutions. If we do not make some massive revisions in the system, then I'm afraid I too will join the ranks of those advocating the "de-schooled" society of Ivan Illich. But as I see it, there is still some hope left if we can get the educators of the United States to act with bold new but long overdue sensible ventures. Like the prisons in the United States, schools must seek different methods.

Last year I spoke to the entire Third National Seminar audience in Florida where I described the efforts of our pre- K-12 Wilson School on the Mankato State Campus. At the conclusion of my remarks I challenged each of you to return home to develop your own Wilson schools--the fact that it is easy to do if you really believe--that the Wilson story describing the remarkable change which occurred in a short period of time was realistic. I further indicated that I was asking you to do nothing more than I was willing to do; that I was changing positions during the summer to start a college for all seasons--a year-round truly personalized flexible teacher education program at Mankato State. I indicated that I had to face all the problems and more than you faced.

Finally last month I was released from Wilson to start this new program on the condition that I would continue as a consultant to Wilson. Thus we are underway. The mission for January through March is to get approval from all the committees, organize the program, get students enrolled, meet with the state department to have our people certified without the usual badges represented by education courses, meet with other heads of programs throughout the college, and work with the college Task Force. Mankato State as a college has made a decision to try to retool all of its programs. We want to come up with several new plans for college education by September. The State College System in Minnesota is in ferment at the moment. The new Minnesota Metropolitan State College, the seventh institution in the system, is opening this winter with no freshmen or sophomores, no buildings, no campus: the Twin Cities will be the learning centers, with the focus on upper classmen, minority groups, and individuals who cannot attend a traditional college setting because of financial, family, and other concerns.

The School of Educational Alternatives which I am heading will be an attempt to immediately operationalize different alternatives for preparing teachers. It will be an open, personalized approach. There will be no required courses. It will be concerned about people rather than methods. It will focus on preparing educators to work in Wilson-type schools; we must be taught in the same fashion we are expected to teach. Colleges are presently the worst educational system in the United States. We are hoping that Mankato State can help lead the reform. We hope to have students enrolled and the program functioning by this April.

Purpose

My primary task today originally was to tell you about our new year-round college teacher education program. I still intend to do that, but I am going to further sidetrack briefly for two reasons: first, because we do not at this moment have students enrolled I cannot describe our actual programs in operation, but only what we plan to do starting in April; second, our college arrangements don't make much sense unless they are tied closely to reform at the pre- K-12 levels.

Moving to a year-round program is not enough; that is simple to do--a mere mechanical procedure. We could have done that at the college level already just by changing calendars. Of course, to what calendar would we change if we are to meet the needs of all the various year-round public school plans developing: the 45/15, the quinmester, the four quarter, the flexible 12-month school or other? If real improvement is to occur, there must be massive reform in all elements of the school, not just the calendar. A true year-round school is continuously open to provide for personalized, individualized needs and interests whenever there is personal desire or time available from the job and/or family responsibilities.

The public schools and colleges must work in harmony. There is no need to fight each other, to arrange calendars to fit some other system. Wilson Campus School and the School of Educational Alternatives at Mankato State hope to continue to show how this can be done at a practical, realistic level throughout the schools and colleges of the United States.

Change

We are being overwhelmed these days with books, articles, and speeches on why schools must change. If one needs more in this area, authors such as Trump, Illich, Gardner, Friedenberg, Coleman, Silberman, and hundreds of others are available in local book stores. Here we are including just a few reminders of why all educators must seriously re-evaluate today's schools.

For example, we are still hamstrung by outmoded laws, regulations, and traditions. The "magic date" in most states is but just one example--that date whereby students are admitted to kindergarten by watching one minute tick away on the clock to determine if they are old enough and ready for school. We know that the best trained teachers and more money should be in the traditional 5-6-7-year-old programs, yet that is where we still spend the least. We know that the concept of a 7th grade is ridiculous, as 7th graders are spread in acheivement from traditional grade 3 through grade 13, yet we still have graded schools. We know that the eight-year study indicated that the traditional high school requirements had no validity, yet we still have the four years of English, three of social studies syndrome. We know that the really important requirements are in the areas of non-paid social service, child growth and development, human relations, students teaching students, work experiences, and a more balanced emphasis on what is important, yet few schools do these things.

We know that the Ivy Tower must be reformed. We can't tolerate 50 more years of departments, lectures, final exams, required textbooks, and arguments about whether teaching, research, or writing is the college professor's role. We know that teacher education is learned in the general culture; six-year-olds have a hard time playing doctor, but they can play school beautifully. They can do everything the teacher can. College methods courses are of little value. Yet colleges perpetuate the same old system.

Wilson

In July, 1968, those at Wilson School made the decision for dramatic reform, and now the School of Educational Alternatives is making the same commitment. Because I spoke about Wilson last year, and will discuss the college yet in this presentation, only a brief glimpse is provided here. However, it is felt important that those of you who have not yet made the change realize it can be done, and for those who have changed and are looking for teachers, we hope to provide them.

Further, the general philosophy of both programs and a detailed description of Wilson are available in the book Creating Humane Schools (Campus Publishers, Box 1055, Mankato, MN 56001). In addition, the document, "A Proposal for The School of Educational Alternatives," is available from that office at Mankato State. At this moment then a brief glance at Wilson is presented.

Several studies of innovative schools have attempted to identify the processes or procedures by which change and flexibility have been achieved in school programs. Such groupings as teaming, differentiated staffing, individualizing, scheduling, technology, openness, independent study, curricular revisions, mini-courses, and others are among the many described.

Wilson found that no one such approach was valid; instead, all of them must be interwoven. Six major components of the school were identified: philosophy, learning styles, curriculum, organization, facilities, and evaluation. Nine to twelve sub-listings were found under each component, or a total of 69 identified changes which were necessary to achieve the desired flexibility. Not one of the six components could be omitted totally or for any length of time. Of the 69 changes, the other 68 did not work as well if one of the 69 were ignored. This multi-factored interrelated concept led to a most flexible school environment. Some of the 69 changes are briefly discussed here in an attempt to describe the program currently (January 1972) in operation.

Probably the most important facet of the present Wilson effort--the one that really makes a difference--is the person-to-person emphasis. Without a doubt, the real changes in the school revolve around the human relationships--not scheduling, carpeting, team teaching, or individualized instruction.

At Wilson, students select their own teachers--facilitators--partners in learning. There is little difference between students and teachers; rather the relationship is described as people helping people learn. No student is ever assigned to a teacher or reverse. There are six factors that are just crucial in attaining this person match: personality, perception, age, sex, interest, skill. How many principals or computers or teachers in most schools sit down to determine whether 6-year-old Billy needs a young swinger in a short skirt, a grandma, a daddy, or a combination of these, at this moment in his life?

Youngsters no longer sign up for courses; in fact, there are no courses to select. Instead they find people with whom they would like to learn in an interrelated fashion. After they have been involved in a meaningful learning experience, they give their involvement a "title" to record on their experience sheet. This means that there are no required courses, K-12. Wilson is completely non-graded; 6-year-olds are often working together with 18-year-olds. The younger folk generally have the same choices and alternatives available to older individuals.

The students further select their own advisor-counselor. Each adult becomes a warm, empathetic friend to those youngsters who have selected that individual for guidance and a close personal relationship. There are none of the one counselor to 300 students ratios. These practices, which so obviously rely on people for successful implementation, soon led to the realization that the affective domain was the real key to success in any school, but especially one attempting to be open and flexible. Self-image, success, peer and adult relationships, family considerations become the crucial issues.

Closely on the heels of the affective area, especially for the younger persons, comes the psychomotor. That is why physical education, industrial arts, and home economics, and then music and art are the most important areas for primary age children. The cognitive is still important, but only after, or at the same time, that assurances are available that the affective and psychomotor are in good shape. There is no problem in learning reading and math skills, for example, if the affective and motor areas are strong; all the reading instruction in the world doesn't help if the affective area isn't solved before or in conjunction with the cognitive tasks. This is why personalized programming for each student is practiced at Wilson. Group requirements are impossible when students are given personal attention.

As programs became personalized, it was apparent that individual learning styles demanded individualized learning methods. About 80 percent of an individual's time at Wilson is spent in one-to-one conferences with an adult and/or in informal self-developed groupings of students, in independent study, and in open lab. About 20 percent of the day is spent in small groups of five or six, generally the biggest "class" at Wilson. On occasions, common thread large groups are conducted on topics of interest. The first three years these combinations were arranged through a "daily smorgasbord" operation; each day a brand new master schedule was constructed. This fourth year the school is piloting an "unseen schedule." Students arrange meeting times with other staff and students as business people arrange conferences--by appointments as necessary. There is no longer a master schedule built in the office or by teams at Wilson.

In this type of philosophy, optional attendance to both school and "classes" became a must, as did a completely open campus for all students. Students were trusted and adopted a slogan of "with freedom goes responsibility and courtesy." Staff members have the same degrees of freedom. Obviously dress codes, bells, notes from home, and all the rest were eliminated.

The school operates on a twelve-month clock; students may drop in, drop out, speed up, slow down, start, stop whenever they wish. There are no quarters, semesters, or end of the year. Students may vacation whenever they wish. The same program is offered in July and January. All day food service is available. The concept of a lunch period again indicates the inhumaneness of schools. The "protein nibblers" should eat six meals a day.

There are no graduation requirements from high school. A student may take four years "basket weaving." Diplomas are awarded through individual evaluations, not group requirements. There are no report cards; even seniors get no class rank, grade point average, credits, or other; yet they are accepted in the colleges and universities.

To provide more flexibility, students select one of four options to follow as guidelines toward their learning activities. The free option gives students tremendous leeway; the open option provides freedom, but with more evaluation; the planned option is a similar approach but guarantees more guidance; the closed option provides more structure. These options are selected during a conference which includes both parents, the child, and the advisor. They can be altered whenever desired.

Differentiated staffing, three nights a week for a lighted school, efforts to truly interrelate curricula through three teams (Studios for Evolving Persons, Studios for Emerging Environments, and Studios for Future Media), non-paid social service, human relations curricula--person-to-person type learning experiences--, remodeled facilities, student exchanges to Mexico and Indian reservations, a school without walls, 3 and 4-year-old programs, and many other such concepts are involved at Wilson as parts of the massive changes necessary to achieve true flexibility in the school.

Alternatives

Throughout the United States today, the question constantly surfaces among groups considering change in their schools as to the mechanics--the logistics--of how their public districts can achieve their versions of Wilson, or how colleges can prepare teachers for such school systems? The answer is relatively both easy and obvious. The simple directions are to create humane alternatives for people at both the public school and state college and university levels. The remainder of this presentation is devoted to how this can be achieved by offering the proposed plans at Mankato State as possible guidelines for the future.

The entire socity in the U.S.A. is based upon a system of alternatives, so why not include school systems? You can be a democrat or a republican, a Catholic or a Lutheran, you can choose Dr. Smith or Dr. Jones for your family, you can have apple or pumpkin pie, you can paint your house blue or yellow, you can buy an RCA or an Admiral, you can be a salesman or a soldier, you can buy a Ford or a Chevrolet, you can live in warm Arizona or cold Minnesota; but in education, you are divided by the old Berlin Wall. If you live on the west side of the wall you go to West School; if you live on the east side, you go to East School.

We can no longer continue to mandate schools from September to June. What research indicates that people can't learn in the summer? Can we afford to keep school buildings open only 1/4 of the day, 1/2 of the days of the year, and 3/4's of the months of the year? Why not mandate schools from April to December if one wants a nine-month school. In Minnesota it would make much more sense for many people.

It just doesn't make sense for the schools and colleges of the United States to operate without alternatives. The task now is to present these alternative methods which can be adopted to fit any college or school concerned about helping all kids, not just those who can adapt to one, or else somehow survive the system.

Methods

There are at least seven or more approaches to "how" alternatives can be provided: (1) the total school approach; (2) the school-within-a-school approach; (3) the flexible school with individualized student options; (4) the stations-within-a-school plan; (5) the school in the community, or school-without-walls approaches; (6) the common market headquarters school using total district resources to complete its programs; (7) the cluster college or cluster system whereby total sub-systems are set up with several regions of the district or within the total college.

Present leaders in the community are always talking about their CC--their Cohesive Community--this is the way we want it in our community. As more and more attacks are made upon the school systems, they now find that their

8

CC has become a Crumbling Consensus. But rather than being dismayed, this should be seen as a tremendous opportunity, for now the communities can create a new interpretation of their CC--that of Creative Choices. These seven approaches will work in any system or college regardless of size; the mechanics of implementation vary, but the philosophy and guidelines are the same. Several examples are now briefly cited to give evidence as to how these approaches are actually accomplished.

One of the easiest ways to begin is to do as was done in Mankato, by the utilization of the total school approach. One building can be set aside as at Wilson and made an alternative school for the entire district. At Wilson parents and students attend strictly on a voluntary basis; no one is forced to attend but the school is available for whose who select it. The program can be conducted in a pre k - 12 basis within one building, or if in a given community the choice is still to separate ages, or if physical structures almost force separation of ages, then one school can become a k-5 open school, another a 6-8 open middle school, and then a 9-12 high school can be conducted. District size also affects this plan, but that it is feasible, Wilson stands as living proof. This one school approach can also be a way to pilot the year-round program in any district.

Some communities get all upset over the fact the one neighborhood is going to lose its "neighborhood school." This answer is simple too. Assume that a district has nine elementary schools. The oldest near the center of town that usually is least desirable to most people, and nearest the transportation crossways of the district can become the open school for all elementary students who desire to attend; it becomes a school for the entire district. The other eight schools can then be divided into neighborhood attendance areas, so that everyone is assigned to one of the eight schools as their home base. There are now conventional neighborhood schools for all, and an open school for the entire district for those students who volunteer to transfer there.

The school-within-a-school is a very popular version in that it allows each district to retain the neighborhood school, or at least a regional cluster within the district by developing different alternative approaches within each school. Some have had difficulty implementing this because internal factions develop among the staff. The key to success here is to praise all the approaches; don't let the concept develop that "we are better," or "we are the liberals and those are the old stick-in-the-muds." Be proud of each program, give each recognition, each their share of the tax dollar. Indicate that we stress cooperation in the district and we provide for all of our teachers, students, and parents. There won't be any difficulty then. Stress the American ideals of motherhood, apple pie, democracy.

Specifically, a high school, depending upon its size, might develop an open program, a moderate program, and a contemporary approach as three large basic structures within the school, as well as a small free school, a person center for those who "hate the world," and a school without walls for those who prefer to work with community resources.

A large high school of 3200 might offer the following 18 approaches with the same budget, staff, and facilities. Obviously spaces such as the gymnasium, swimming pool, home economics complex, and other such special areas need compromise scheduling among the various programs, but this is just a minor mechanical adjustment.

In this large school of 3200, approximately 500 can be placed in a wing or annex of a building where they can headquarter to operationalize a very open, flexible Wilson type school. Another 1000 can operate on the first floor or another wing in a modular scheduled type of flexible program, more rigid than the first, but more flexible than the next group of 500 who could operate on the second floor in a much more structured type conventional approach. That occupies about 2000-2200 students. The remaining thousand will be pretty much out of the building, so it will alleviate building space problems, while providing more options. Staff and budget are provided for these out-of-school projects because fewer staff and materials are needed for the 2000 who remain within the building.

The other programs could be as follows: 100 in a crusader school to solve a community problem; 100 in a service program to help in orphanages, rest homes, and others; 50 in a free school type program; 50 in a wilderness survival type school; 100 in a broadway school--using the total city as a campus; 100 in an arts program; 100 working full time; 100 in an independent study approach; 100 in a bi-lingual study language on-site school; 100 in an academy--pushing hard on the old academics; 50 in a commune school; 50 in a travel school; 50 in a program run entirely by students; and 50 in a person school. These are all practical and realistic now.

In an elementary school of 450-550, depending upon the staff-student ratio, seven rooms at one end of the building can be reserved for a self-contained k-6 approach. Six rooms in the middle can be utilized for a k-6 multi-unit type of team teaching arrangement; five rooms at the other end of the building can be turned into a very flexible, open, personalized school. As parents and students enroll in their still neighborhood school concept, they have the choice of any of the three programs. If they find they made the wrong choice, they can switch to one of the others with no real problem and still see their friends before and after school, at lunch, and other times.

10

Another approach used in smaller elementary schools has been to set aside two or three rooms still as self-contained teacher rooms, but with students enrolled in a non-graded multi-age k-6 country school. This retains the structure of a closed system, but permits openness within the room, and those three teachers can start sharing and teaming as they desire.

To show the practical application of these ideas in a realistic situation, three schools are now described in a district not far from Mankato. They have nine elementary schools, three junior highs, and two high schools, one a brand new building; both high schools are already labeled progressive and are on modular scheduling. Their elementary schools are trying more flexibility. Unfortunately, the students still have no choice. They are mandated into their neighborhood school.

One elementary building in that district is very new and somewhat innovative. But all of their k-2 students were forced into self-contained rooms. For grades 3-6, each grade had a big open flexible pod, but all in that grade level had the same program. A single adjustment moves it from a good school toward a great school. The self-contained rooms should be available for k-6, not just k-2 students. The present 3rd and 4th grade pods could be made into team teaching for grades k-6 in multi-age units; the 5th and 6th grade pods could be turned into a very open k-6 school. Thus everyone in that neighborhood would have choices within the present building with no physical remodeling, no cost to the district, no additional staff.

A junior high in that district is still on a very rigid bell ringing, hall pass most traditional ever approach. A simple adjustment again is needed. The building was constructed in three wings, fortunately easy to convert. One wing can be the open school, one the moderate, and one the contemporary or conventional approach. Again no costs or other dramatics, just a mechanical rearrangement of time schedules and space utilization.

The brand new high school has wonderful carpeted air conditioned pods; unfortunately all students have the same approach, and all go to the social studies pod, English pod, and other, on their assigned and independent modules. One easy conversion, the station-in-the-school approach, could find these different alternatives within each pod. Some of the staff and cubicles could be used for the open approach, some for the moderate approach, and some for the contemporary. Thus the social studies people, for example, keep their same stations, their same pod, but within it are variations, so that when the student goes to social studies, he can select the station approach that best fits his needs. The open student would have an advisor and then move to these open stations throughout the day.

Another modification of this is to develop one pod as a very open school with interrelated curricular offerings sharing the facilities, while another two pods could be for the modular approach with teaming among English and foreign language in one pod and social studies and math in another, for example. The third pod for the conventional approach could be divided into equal use by English, language, social studies, and math teachers. Such examples are limitless; much depends upon the size of the district and present building structures, but alternatives are possible.

Another variation, often especially plausible at the college level is the "cluster school or college" approach. Using a school of 14,000 like Mankato State as an example, perhaps 7,000 students could remain in a large maxi-college similar to the structured program which now exists. Three thousand could be in an open Wilson type college; another 1000 could be in a small liberal arts type college; another 1000 more in a free college; another 1000 in a university-without-walls plan; and still another 1000 could be in various offshoots of the larger, basic arrangements.

These clusters operate as autonomous units as far as staff, programming, and other. They often have their own buildings. They share some facilities, and still operate under a general college administration, but they do offer six completely different alternative approaches to meet individual learning styles. There is no additional cost or staffing; again the key is reallocation of resources.

Colleges

Much background has been given as to why schools must change, what Wilson did as an example, and how alternatives can be developed in schools and colleges throughout the United States. This was all necessary prelude to a description of the new program of teacher education at Mankato State for those are the kinds of schools, the kind of philosophy which will permeate SEA. We will be developing teachers for these approaches. There is a 25 page single-spaced document written on the plans which is available, so here the description will be just to add a few specifics as to how the alternatives approach will work. All of these alternative approaches are intended to work in either nine or twelve-month - school programs.

The School of Education Alternatives (SEA) is proposed as one of the increasing number of sites located throughout the world dedicated to the launching of inspiring educational exploration missions--"Futureports" for evolving persons and ideas. Participants in SEA will individually and collectively seek new learning worlds, not as worlds to be conquered, but rather as new adventures to be shared; as they vision future histories, an attempt will be made to

12

pioneer creative, different, and better ideas and approaches for education in that future--whether education be thought of primarily in a form found within walls, without walls, or in the de-schooled society of Illich and Reimers. But even more, an immediate now incentive, in harmony with the long-range goals of SEA, will be the establishment at Mankato State College of a program providing for alternative learning styles and opportunities--learning for learning's sake--for persons pursuing a career in what is now traditionally labeled teacher education.

The School of Educational Alternatives, as an integral part of the School of Education, will provide another type of innovation thrust and, as its name suggests, will offer close to twenty different approaches for experiences, most of which will be based upon a very open, flexible learning style, though tailored and structured as much as possible to meet the interests and desires of each individual student.

Close cooperation will be sought from faculty members in the many other schools, divisions, departments, and programs within the total structure of Mankato State. It is essential to the long-range success of SEA that work, experiences, or courses completed through the various branches of the college be taught in a manner similar to the approaches advocated in SEA; future teachers should learn through the same concepts as they are expected to use to help other students learn; namely, in an individualized, self-paced, flexible, year-round school approach.

Ultimately SEA, the Experimental Studies program, and other such pilots at MSC may form a beginning for a new structure within the total college, with satellite centers in Mexico, the Twin Cities, the rural areas, or wherever throughout the continents it might be profitable and manageable to have small specialized bases for depth involvement, or wherever independent learning opportunities are available for individual students. The universities-without-walls movement, the non-campus universities such as Empire State College and Minnesota Metropolitan State College, the external degree programs in New York and Oklahoma, and the Open University in Great Britain will all have an impact upon an interrelationship with SEA. The WORLD WILL BE THE CLASSROOM.

Further, SEA will be a COLLEGE FOR ALL SEASONS. No longer can universities conduct all their programs on quarter, semester, or summer school calendars. Once a student is cared for personally, a student may enter or leave, as in a hospital, on any day or period of the year. This will be essential as school districts move to 45-15, quinmesters, quadrimesters, continuous learning years, and such other forms of the year-round school concept. Not all teachers will be free the same summer periods as in the past, or the same months in the varied new plans.

Colleges must be able to accommodate graduate students or graduating high school seniors at the time they are free to study.

For this first year, the education content for certification may be taken in a very open manner. Hopefully, arrangements can be made through Arts and Sciences and the Experimental College to also take work in what was formerly thought of as the two-year general education requirement in a very flexible approach. The Curriculum Committee is being asked to waive the standard two-year requirements. In other words, three of the four years of undergraduate work would then be able to be completed with a great deal of personalization. The major area concentration will depend upon what retooling occurs within the School of Arts and Sciences. At the graduate level, most of the work can be tailored more individually than in the past.

Rather than remain static, the focus will be on the constant conceptualization and implementation of new ideas. SEA will feature a person-centered, humanistic philosophy, with the emphasis on the future rather than on the past or present. Persons studying in SEA will concentrate on competencies in three broad areas of concern: (1) Person Success Experiences, (2) Research Field Experiences, and (3) Interrelated Interest Experiences, including the technological achievements, human relationships, and environmental decisions which will cause such a dramatic change in materialistic and humanistic life styles, and thus in the entire value system as we reach toward the 21st Century.

Though one of the realistic goals will be a newer, more flexible but still valid teacher certification for most students in SEA, the true goal will be that of aiding the growth of an evolving person. The emphasis will not be on examinations, credits, and degrees, but rather on encouraging the flowering of warm, empathetic human beings who are concerned first about persons, and who in helping these persons learn use indirect methods to guide, motivate, support, and facilitate the learning process. Interrelationship of curricular experiences is a must; education should be seen as a birth-to-death process, with a realization that the majority of the learning experiences will and should take place outside the classroom walls of the Mankato State campus buildings.

In summary, perhaps the findings of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, quoted from the April, 1971, issue of Compact, may best herald the call for dramatic new approaches in colleges and universities. "_____ few major innovations have been instituted in higher education. With the failure of the nerve of many faculties, few alternatives for a liberal education have been conceptualized, let alone implemented. Undergraduate programs continue to provide degrees on the basis of credit hours completed and compiled. Graduate and professional programs under the banner of high standards, have too often maintained barriers that are simply formal; they are not of a kind conducive to learning."

Evaluation

The conventional districts and colleges have basically failed to provide any major research and evaluation related to their present programs. The early innovative schools made the same mistake. The School of Educational Alternatives plans to work with school districts to develop new evaluation tools for the affective, psychomotor, and cognitive areas to fit the kinds of open programs being advocated.

One of the steps taken will be to support research teams for each college of education and school systems, or in some type of cooperative arrangement between the college and school systems in the state. Needed on the team are at least three "experts": one in the affective, one in the psychomotor, and one in the cognitive, along with an administrative coordinator to handle the needed financial support, publications, and public relations. Those on the team would have national people contacts, knowledge of the current literature, and of present studies and past reaearch in their field, plus would work together to develop new approaches to evaluating open schools and colleges, and individuals functioning within those programs.

Further, training in retooling for districts is proposed. Educational marathons, teacher centers, student "seekouts" for new ideas, and study of future histories must replace the outworn system of present inservice education. The concept of the teacher center, with one day a week for each teacher to retool in the center is one of the promising time rearrangements for staff, as are the 4/40 and eventually two shift 3/30 work weeks for the majority of American employees. The School of Educational Alternatives plans to employ these directions. Research, evaluation, and retooling will lead to a re-study of school calendars for example. We know now that the 45/15, the quarter system, the quinmester, the continuous year, or the personalized 12-month voluntary-mandatory systems are not yet the best answers for 12-month school approaches. But in the meantime school districts must adopt and adapt from those ideas which are available. The SEA program at Mankato State will provide a continuous 12-month college program which will permit teacher in-service no matter when the vacation period.

But through all the research, evaluation, and retooling, one thing has stood out above all else in Wilson type schools--the key is the warm empathetic body who can really turn kids on. Students in open schools have listed the characteristics of the outstanding teacher: cares about kids; has a sense of humor; makes each student feel important; doesn't show preferences among students; respects the students; has lots of ideas and a good imagination; has high expectations for all persons; is respected by both students and adults; cares about the experience being learned. These characteristics do not deal with the content of the traditional school of education; they deal with people, not methods. The only characteristic coming close to methods is that the teacher knows how to mix learning with fun. Recruiting the right person and helping improve the person qualities makes the difference in teaching.

Challenge

We know that students in the elementary schools today will live well into the 21st Century. They will work four-day weeks, they will retire at age 50; they may live to age 125. Certainly the present school system doesn't prepare students for that kind of future. Even worse, it discriminates horribly against the "poor" and the "slower learner."

Are schools going to wait until 1980, or 1990, or 2000 before they change? Year-round, lighted, community schools are not theory; technology is here but only beginning to have an impact. Eight out of ten jobs available now are for the non-college graduate. If we continue to plan and plan and talk, we will be so tired we'll have no energy left to act. It is time now to immediately make skeleton plans for reform; save the energy for action and for retooling the product as it develops. In dealing with persons, actual programs must be tried--they can't be evaluated on the drawing board. We must now act.

Obviously massive change will cause emotional upheaval in the schools and colleges, but it is time that we must question some sacred cows. Socrates was accused of impiety and innovation, and was forced to commit suicide by drinking hemlock.

The School of Educational Alternatives at Mankato State may drink some hemlock before the final battle, but in the meantime we are convinced that alternative learning styles must be available in every public school district and college. It is the mission of SEA to prepare teachers for the retooling of education. We are convinced that if we all work together, we can take the lid off the old educational pot, and truly develop Alternative Public Schools and Colleges for All Seasons.

16-A

FOUR O'CLOCK HIGH

Kenny C. Guinn

Las Vegas, Nevada, has entered into a new approach to building utilization and to providing educational opportunities for students. At the beginning of the 1970-71 school year, a school opened which is unique in that it operates, not in the traditional morning hours, but rather in the late afternoon and continues through the early evening hours with an educational program for senior high school students. Many schools and school systems have offered evening programs and evening classes in high school subjects, but this school is different. Its intent is to provide a complete high school program similar to other schools except in its hours of operation.

The school operates in a building facility which is already used once during the day for normal capacity of 2,500 students. Beginning again at 4:30 p.m. another 500 students begin their school day. They begin at that time, not because the school is overcrowded and the double sessions are necessary, but rather because these students have chosen this as the time at which it is most convenient for them to attend classes. The first assumption expressed by those who review the program is that it must be for those who are forced to work and that the program is a second choice. This is true for some of the students, but working is not a stipulation for enrollment in the program. The student who used employment as an escape from school must face his action honestly. He can now continue school even though he must work during the day.

Others have assumed that this is a program for students who did not successfully adjust to school and that this program was designed to isolate them from the mainstream of students. It is true that some of the students have had problems in school, but the school is unique in that no student was assigned to the school. All of the students enrolled in the program voluntarily as the school they wish to attend.

BACKGROUND

The complete program of high school studies for the evening hours is an outgrowth of another program which is now approximately two years old in the Las Vegas schools. This forerunner to the evening high school was a series of classes initiated to provide an additional opportunity for students who had not adjusted satisfactorily to the day program and who were required to attend evening classes in isolation from the majority of the student body. It was found that students who adjusted to the early evening program were reluctant to return to the mainstream when given an opportunity. Students in this early forerunner were encouraged and assisted in seeking employment. The money they earned and responsibility they accepted gave a new meaning to their need to stay in school. With this background it was recognized that students were expressing a need and a desire to have an opportunity to attend a school program different from that which is traditionally offered in the morning and early afternoon hours.

Perhaps a part of the success of the evening program was a realization by the staff that students who chose this unorthodox schedule were sufficiently self-thinking to help determine and design their own programs of instruction. Perhaps it was the staff that was willing to listen to the students' needs and to design their instruction in response to the needs of students rather than in a predetermined manner. Regardless of what the cause may have been, those students who were given a second chance for an educational program were receptive to the opportunity and willing to accept the notorieties of being different in their educational pursuit.

NEED FOR THE PROGRAM

It was expected that some students would wish to attend the evening high school program to place them on the same schedule as their parents, who might be working in the gambling industry during the evening and early morning hours. It has, however, been found that very few of the students fall in this category.

Although Las Vegas is a 24-hour town, a surprisingly small number of students are in any way associated with that aspect of the city. All of the reasons expressed by students for choosing this school are as likely to occur in any city as in Las Vegas, Nevada. It is perhaps even more applicable to other cities not oriented to a 24-hour operation than to one which operates around the clock. It is possible for many more students to find after-school employment when the town continues to operate 24 hours a day, than it would be if they are confined to seeking employment during the regular day of business operations. For that reason this is probably the most illogical city to begin an evening high school program. There has, however, been a need for the program recognized in this locality and it may well be duplicated in any of the cities willing to listen to the needs and desires of their population.

FACILITIES UTILIZATION

One influence which encouraged the planning of an evening high school program was the facility shortage which is expected to become more acute over the next two or three years. Schools have for years organized double session classes when the building construction program fell behind. These have been considered emergency measures and something which provided a less than desirable school program. In Las Vegas, a second school has opened to utilize the same facilities which are occupied during the normal school hours. The building capacity has been raised from 2, 500 to 3, 000 students without any deterioration of the original program. In addition it provides the opportunity to establish a complete and separate program more in line with the needs and desires of that student population.

Another unappealing aspect of the usual double session is the additional load that is placed on the administrative team. Even though additional staff is added to handle increased students, the responsibility of the administrator spans the entire day and includes the entire program. In the Las Vegas plan, the building principal is in no way responsible for the program of activities which operates during the evening hours. Although the building principal has first and initial responsibility for the facility, the evening program does not cause an administrative overload because it has been separated entirely from his responsibility. The director of the evening program has the total authority and responsibility for the development and implementation of the program, and is answerable to the building principal only in relation to the facility and equipment assigned to that building.

STAFF AND STAFF UTILIZATION

"Moonlighting" has long been a way of life for teachers. When the concept of an evening program was first advanced, it was recognized that this provided an opportunity for teachers to add to their income without leaving their professions. It was also recognized that a part-time "moonlighting" staff would not provide all the stability which was needed by the students. In initial planning it was outlined that the teachers who taught in the evening program as their prime responsibility would compose approximately half of the total staff. The remainder were to be employees who have as their major responsibility a full contract in the day operation of schools within the District. As it has developed, more than half of the program is carried by teachers who have a primary responsibility in some other program and accept a one or two subject assignment in the evening program.

District regulations allow employees to be employed for a maximum of ten hours per week beyond the regular school assignment. With this opportunity an instructor who is physically capable and who feels the financial need to seek employment beyond the normal contract may do so without leaving his profession and without wasting the talent and training which has gone into the development of a professional teacher.

PLANNING

The need for this type of program was recognized throughout the 1969-70 school year and in February of 1970 approval was granted by the Board of School Trustees to begin the planning for an evening high school to begin in the 1970-71 school year. Although permission was granted to proceed with the planning in February, the pressures of District operation were such that no assignment of the responsibility of planning was made until April 1970. At that time it was acknowledged that with only five months remaining before the opening of the 1970-71 school year, it was highly improbable that the school could open at the same time as the other schools of the county. Permission, however, was granted to proceed with planning toward implementation at the regular scheduled opening time of August 24, 1970.

The initial planning began with a rough outline of the concept and intent of the program in sufficient detail to submit to the State Department of Education for permission to apply for normal school funding for this program scheduled to begin its operation at approximately the time schools normally close. The State Department representatives quickly recognized the needs and desirability of such a program and gave immediate approval for the 1970 opening.

Without fanfare or announcement, a survey was handed to every student who was expected to enroll in the senior high schools of the metropolitan Las Vegas area approximately two weeks prior to the end of the 1969-70 school year. The survey explained briefly the intent of the program to offer to students the opportunity to attend classes during the early evening hours and asked that the students indicate whether or not they would be interested in receiving further information regarding the program. It is quite significant that approximately 20 per cent of all students contacted indicated an interest in knowing more about the program. This was in no way a commitment on the part of the student to enroll in the school but was at least indicative of the fact that the students did not reject the concept of the school. The school now serves approximately 500 students which represents 4 per cent of the total District high school enrollment.

Follow-up questionnaires were distributed to determine the type and extent of the staff that would be required if the program could be implemented. Much of the original planning had to be abandoned or modified as the students finally began the process of enrollment. Course choices changed and many of the students who finally enrolled were not those who had originally expressed an interest.

If any district wishes to implement a program which duplicates this offering of a high school program in the early evening hours, it should recognize that no survey will identify the students who are going to attend the school, nor identify specifically the courses that will be required. If the district is willing, or finds it necessary to implement this type program, it must be prepared to proceed with very little solid evidence of need. The single factor which can guarantee the success of the program is a person selected as administrator of the program who will accept the authority to make decisions relative to scheduling and course offerings which might deviate from all other schools in the district. The administrator of the program must recognize that he is not operating a program which will have the same type of clientele found in the regular day program, and methods must be adapted to the clientele. Required conformity to established methods and procedures could well spell failure for the program. No district should enter into the program if it is not willing to allow the site administrator to make program decisions in response to the needs of students. No district that is so bound by regulation and rules that an administrator must seek prior approval can successfully initiate a program of this type. To be successful, this program must be responsive to the needs and desires of students, and the administrator and staff must have the flexibility and versatility to move toward satisfying those needs immediately upon recognizing them.

Although it is necessary to recognize and acknowledge possible problems relative to a school program, much of the planning for this type program must be effected at the minute when the student has been identified and he has expressed his needs. A district that does not dare to be different should not consider moving into this program but should confine themselves to the more traditional solutions to the problems which may confront the district.

FUTURE OF THE PROGRAM

The success of the program to this point has demonstrated that students are willing to accept a program of studies outside the hours which have traditionally been allocated for school. Many students who have accepted this alternative have done so at the expense of abandoning friends and classmates. They have been willing to give up many school activities which comprise a major part of the high school program. Without analyzing the reasons for students requesting and requiring this alternative opportunity, it has been demonstrated that a significant number of students find this a more desirable and convenient time for school attendance.

The acceptance of the program may contribute to a short life of a separate and distinct evening high school. Rather than continuing a totally separate high school program, it may soon become incumbent upon every senior high school administrator to provide the educational opportunities for all students to select, not only the courses and activities in which they wish to engage, but also to select the schedule which is most convenient to their personal life. When administrators provide an educational program continuously for 14 hours a day, the students will have an opportunity to select the most convenient time to fulfill their needs. When the students can be considered regular students of the high school, regardless of the time selected for attendance, the students will then satisfy their own personal scheduling and educational needs.

16B

THE PARKWAY PROGRAM – "THE EVERYWHERE SCHOOL"

Leonard B. Finkelstein

On February 17, 1969, 143 Philadelphia High School students took to the streets, without leaving school. They were the first students of the Parkway Program, a new kind of high school which challenged many traditional concepts of secondary education: There were no grades, no dress codes, few "rules". There was not even a school building -- instead, students were encouraged to find their classrooms, their curriculum and in some cases their teachers from among the plentiful resources of their urban community. They were sent to learn where the action was.

The question underlying the Program's foundation was simple: could the resources of the urban community, concentrated as they were within a relatively small geographical area, be used to educational advantage for a broad cross section of secondary school students? Few doubted that they could be, however, methods of how they might be utilized so that both the students and the city would benefit mutually were yet to be established. The Program was left with the task of trying to integrate school children with the life of the community, a life which, under normal conditions, they were not expected to enter until leaving school behind them -- for although schools are supposed to prepare students for a life in the community, most schools so isolate students from the community that a functional understanding of how it works is impossible. Few urban educators now deny that large numbers of students are graduating from our urban secondary schools unprepared for any kind of useful role in society. Since society suffers as much as the students from the failures of the educational system, it did not seem unreasonable to ask the community to assume some responsibility for the education of its children.

If such cooperation is to be achieved, it is obvious that the educational institution and the community institution have to stop operating by different rules: the student cannot be expected to go from a passive, unresponsible role in the classroom to an active, effective one in the city. The structure of the classroom must change: rather than encouraging the student to accept, it has to teach him to challenge; instead of teaching him that success comes with inaction and dependence, it has to show him that action and independence bring results. Teachers have to teach differently -- teach skills which work in life as well as on paper, because in a "**school without walls**" the students need to use the skills they picked up this morning the same afternoon.

The objective of the Parkway Program, then, was no less than to put the school in step with the pace of the community, so that students could operate in both. The organization of the Program is not unlike that of a successful business, a business in which individuals, independently and in groups, must work effectively and responsibly toward real solutions to real problems. The structure of the Program is as much the work of the students as of the educational administration, for one of the first problems presented to students was "How do you make a school which teaches students what they need and want to know?" The students continue to take an active role in the planning and administration of their school, for it is their goals which must determine the Program's future directions. Parkway does not aim to be a "school of the future"--but it is not a school of the past. What Parkway hopes to be is a school for now, and a school which will be able to keep up with "now" as the years go by.

The Parkway Program is organized into several "units" or "communities," each of which is limited to 180 students. Each unit operates independently of the others, has its own headquarters, its own staff and its own curriculum. While each unit conforms to a common structural organization, each unit will interpret that organization according to the needs of its immediate population. The principle is simple: condense a large number of people in a small area and you necessarily sacrifice your capacity to treat each member of the group as an individual. Each individual's effectiveness within a group is reduced each time the size of the group is increased. So, if one wishes to maintain an organization in which flexibility and effective individual action are possible, it is necessary to keep the group relatively small. Therefore, as the Parkway Program expands, it does not increase the size of existing units, but forms new ones.

The Parkway Program is a public high school, and as such, is open to any Philadelphia student in grades 9-12 who volunteers for it, regardless of his academic or behavioral background. If more students apply than places are available, Parkway students are chosen by lottery. An equal number of places are allocated to each of the eight geographically determined school districts in Philadelphia so that a cross-cultural, heterogeneous representation is insured within the Program's student body. To further expand the scope of the Program's internal population, a limited number of places, also filled by lottery, are made available to applicants from suburban and parochial systems.

Like the students, staff members must volunteer for the Parkway Program. The Program maintains a student-teacher ratio of approximately 16 to 1, and for every teacher a "university intern" (undergraduate or graduate students representing both local and out of state universities) is added to the staff. Teachers are interviewed and hired by committees representing the Parkway organization, the school district, community professionals, parents, and students. Parkway teachers must meet the usual requirements for certification and the majority of Parkway teachers formerly taught in traditional schools.

The Parkway staff, teachers and interns, are responsible for the basic Parkway curriculum, for student guidance, and for recruiting additional instructional help and materials from within the community. The Parkway teacher's day, then, is likely to be divided between classroom teaching, student counseling, and administrative work with the faculty member himself determining the proportions according to his own interest and skills.

One of the most outstanding aspects of the Parkway Program is that it has no school building. Although central headquarters are provided for each Parkway Program unit where teachers have office space and students have lockers, all classes operate in community facilities. It can accurately be stated that the first obligation of a Parkway teacher is to find a place in which to teach his class: the finding of space is an activity shared by all members of the Program, including students, and is considered an educational activity in itself, requiring a thorough investigation of the city and its spatial resources. The city offers an incredible variety of learning labs: art students study at the Art Museum, biology students meet at the zoo, business and vocational courses meet at on-the-job sites such as journalism at a newspaper, or mechanics at a garage. Academic classes are likely to be found meeting anywhere, with churches, business conference rooms, vacant offices, and public lobbies among those facilities most commonly in use.

The Parkway student finds, at the beginning of each semester, between one and two hundred courses of study available to him. Studies are classified according to subject areas in which student must meet requirements for graduation, however, a wide choice of alternatives is offered in each area, and each student may choose his own way of approaching the subject. In English he may study Shakespeare, television production, or basic reading. A study of municipal government can be substituted for a study of the Civil War for American history credit. "Math" may mean algebra, accounting, computer programming, or retail merchandising. Science can be biology, or work at a local hospital. The choice in each case is the student's, but it can be made only after a thorough examination of the student's needs, interests and goals. It is the faculty's job to see that each student makes this self-analysis. The Parkway curriculum can be broken into five basic areas. These five areas can be further divided as follows: Faculty Offerings and Institutional Offerings are concerned primarily with the instruction of the student; Tutorial, Town Meeting, and Management Groups involve the student in the operation of the Program itself in an educational way. While each student puts together his own program from activities available, choosing his own ways of learning, each student will in some way be involved with all of the areas of the curriculum.

Evaluation at the Parkway Program is an ongoing process in which the student must take at least as great a part as the teacher. In many respects, evaluation is itself the central course of study at the Parkway Program; students must constantly evaluate their goals, needs, and objectives in order to choose courses; they must daily evaluate the effect of those courses in light of their needs and interests. At Parkway, evaluation is a living part of daily activity, not a postmortem which takes place after the damage has been done.

A formal evaluation takes place at the end of each semester -- three times a year. At that time, students and faculty take time to assess their progress, each other's progress, the Program's progress. No "grades" or "marks" are assigned. Each student's record is composed of documents written jointly by the teacher and the student in each course the student takes (including tutorial and work/study programs). The evaluation form will include: The teacher's description of the course and the teacher's evaluation of the work of the student; the student's evaluation of his own progress in it; and the student's evaluation of the teacher, with suggestions for improvement. Reading lists, portfolios of significant work and test scores such as college boards may be added. Three times a year, the whole packet is Xeroxed and sent home instead of a report card by tutorial leaders.

17

EVALUATION MODELS FOR YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

Marvin C. Alkin

Recent changes in the nature of American education have led to the association of three terms which, in the past, were not necessarily related. These three terms are educational accountability, educational innovation, and educational evaluation. The major theme of this paper is the emergence and association of the three terms and their respective meanings.

Educational Accountability. In the broadest of terms, educational accountability asserts that if the student has not learned, then the fault lies with the schools; they have not taught the student to learn. Someone within the school bears the responsibility for the problem and should be held accountable. The high degree of public demand for accountability is obvious to all of us: the needs of schools far exceed available funds; decisions for establishing priorities must be made in light of severe financial restraints; the public is voicing disapproval, in many instances, over the established priorities.

Community discontent, however, is not limited to the public. Teachers, administrators, and students are also vocal and many of them are equally disturbed with our current educational priorities. Teachers are demanding more time and money to develop programs which will improve existing educational practices; many curriculum developers, often supported by teachers, are demanding changes in curriculum; parents and students, though the nature of their demands may differ, are asking for change in the form of relevancy to the world as they relate to it. In recognition of these demands, state and federal pressure is being placed upon educators to involve their communities in such a way as to help reconcile these conflicts and establish educational priorities which will be acceptable to as broad a constituency as possible.

It can be seen that in the term "educational accountability" two considerations emerge. One is for the improvement of existing educational curricula while the other is for the replacement of existing practices with others. As educators we must understand that we no longer enjoy the great public trust in public education that we formerly had. Recent demands for accountability arise from the fact that large segments of society are now demanding that schools be called upon to demonstrate their worth instead of relying upon their past perceived effectiveness.

Of vital importance in this context is the demand for "demonstration of worth." Education must demonstrate that the enterprise is being managed efficiently, that public funds are being well spent, and that they are being spent on programs which meet public needs. We must provide concrete evidence that money is being saved, that students are learning, and that what they learn is compatible, in part, with public demand. We must demonstrate success, then, in our current programs and success in establishing programs to meet the changes emerging in response to the public voice. This last consideration leads us to the second term in our scheme, that of educational innovation.

Educational Innovation. It is no exaggeration to state that today education is in a state of siege. In this siege we have only three alternatives. We can retire and permit, perhaps, "the vouchers" to become established as the new chatelain; we can continue to struggle with our present weaponry behind the walls of custom; or we can go into the field with new weapons and tactics to lift the siege. This latter is the strategy of educational innovation.

Educational innovation is a dynamic process leading to change. Each change in societal and individual needs will bring new problems which in turn will call for innovative solutions. With all innovations, some are accepted and some will be resisted. This is particularly true when the innovation interferes between needs as perceived by the school and needs as perceived by the public. In this sense of resistance and acceptance, innovation is again a dynamic process.

By definition, innovation suggests the development of alternative strategies offering solution to a given problem. Unfortunately, each innovation cannot always be successful in solving every problem. Therefore, we must be able to make decisions among alternatives to determine which will be most successful in meeting our established needs. The information needed to make such decisions can be provided by educational evaluation.

Educational Evaluation. The term evaluation has been used in the past to describe many different kinds of activities. It has been used to describe the process of teachers giving tests during and at the end of the courses; it has been used in relation to almost any and every kind of external examination of school and school-related programs; and it has been used almost synonymously with research. In recent years, however, evaluation in education has achieved a new prominence which has forced us to reconsider the meaning of the term. Basically, this reconsideration is in terms of providing a more precise definition of what we mean by evaluation and greater specification of its components.

We would begin to define evaluation by asserting that the terms "research" and "evaluation" do not describe the same activity. Research is "studious inquiry; usually a critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation dimensions: (1) What is to be evaluated? Is the unit to be evaluated the student, a program, a school? (2) Why is it to be evaluated? What kinds of decisions will be made as a consequence of the evaluation information presented to the decision maker? (3) When must the information be collected? If we are concerned with program modification, then the appropriate information should be collected during the course of the program rather than at its conclusion. These considerations determine the kinds of information needed in order to make the appropriate decisions.

With this orientation toward the needs of the decision maker in mind, the Center defines evaluation as the process of determining the kinds of decisions that have to be made, selecting, collecting, and analyzing information needed in making these decisions, and reporting summary information to the decision-maker. These decision areas have been classified into a five-stage evaluation model as follows:

1. Needs Assessment. Needs assessment involves stating the objectives to be met and determining how well an existing program is doing relative to meeting these needs. This information is used to identify the school or program's needs.

2. Program Planning. In program planning, the evaluator provides the decision maker with tools to help make planning decisions. He also builds into the program the procedures that will be needed for assessing whether it is operating as planned and how well it is achieving its objectives.

3. Implementation Evaluation. Once the program is in operation, an implementation evaluation provides the decision maker with information on the extent to which the specified elements of the program have been implemented as planned.

4. Progress Evaluation. In progress evaluation, the evaluator provides the decision maker with information about the various parts of the program in meeting its objectives. This information is used to modify the program where necessary.

5. Outcome Evaluation. Outcome evaluation provides information about the success of the program as a whole, so that the project director can make decisions such as whether the program should be continued, extended, or discontinued.

One other important note about the model should be made at this time. We see a certain amount of recycling that takes place. Although we present the five evaluation activities in a logical sequence, it is apparent that some of these having for its aim the revision of accepted conclusions in the light of newly discovered facts." Let us examine more carefully some of the aspects of this definition. Research involves experimentation or some other exhaustive investigation. Is this appropriate or needed for the kinds of educational situations we refer to as evaluation? Experimentation may not be appropriate for meeting evaluation needs.

The definition above further stipulates that research has as its "aim" the revision of accepted conclusions. Is our main purpose in school settings only to know about the nature of the entity--to work toward future understanding of phenomena? Surely we have equal responsibility for information related to and useful for students who are here now as compared to understanding phenomena in order to benefit students at some unspecified future time.

The basic purpose of research is the development or revision of scientific knowledge about the nature of an entity based upon incontrovertible evidence. Thus, if the function of a study is to make broadly generalizable statements about an instructional program, that study is research. If a study is conducted to measure changes in pupils' interests, values, etc., in order to understand personality development, that study is research. The current demand for accountability is not a public desire to be informed about research findings. Evaluation does not imply the necessity for scientific generalizations; there is another kind of goal implied.

In terms of how evaluation has been formulated in the past, four major positions or definitions have emerged. These are:

1. Evaluation is the examination of congruence between performance and objectives.
2. Evaluation is synonymous with the professional judgment of experts.
3. Evaluation is synonymous with measurement and testing.
4. Evaluation is synonymous with the use of experimental research techniques.

None of these definitions by itself, however, is sufficient to provide all the necessary information nor to include the multiplicity of activities for which decision makers need information. The point is not that objectives, expert judgment, tests, or experimental design are to be ignored, but rather that each should be recognized for its appropriate contribution in certain kinds of evaluation situations. With the emphasis upon decisions, we have formulated a definition of evaluation which comprises three important dimensions: (1) What is to be evaluated? Is the unit to be evaluated the student, a program, a school? (2) Why is it to be evaluated? What kinds of decisions will be made as a consequence of the evaluation information presented to the decision maker? (3) When must the information be collected? If we are concerned with program modification, then the appropriate information should be collected during the course of the program rather than at its conclusion. These considerations determine the kinds of information needed in order to make the appropriate decisions.

With this orientation toward the needs of the decision maker in mind, the Center defines evaluation as the process of determining the kinds of decisions that have to be made, selecting, collecting, and analyzing information needed in making these decisions, and reporting summary information to the decision-maker. These decision areas have been classified into a five-stage evaluation model as follows:

1. Needs Assessment. Needs assessment involves stating the objectives to be met and determining how well an existing program is doing relative to meeting these needs. This information is used to identify the school or program's needs.

2. Program Planning. In program planning, the evaluator provides the decision maker with tools to help make planning decisions. He also builds into the program the procedures that will be needed for assessing whether it is operating as planned and how well it is achieving its objectives.

3. Implementation Evaluation. Once the program is in operation, an implementation evaluation provides the decision maker with information on the extent to which the specified elements of the program have been implemented as planned.

4. Progress Evaluation. In progress evaluation, the evaluator provides the decision maker with information about the various parts of the program in meeting its objectives. This information is used to modify the program where necessary.

5. Outcome Evaluation. Outcome evaluation provides information about the success of the program as a whole, so that the project director can make decisions such as whether the program should be continued, extended, or discontinued.

One other important note about the model should be made at this time. We see a certain amount of recycling that takes place. Although we present the five evaluation activities in a logical sequence, it is apparent that some of these activities, especially implementation and progress evaluations, may be overlapping in time. The model recognizes, therefore, that decisions made at one point in time may require repeating one or more of the preceding phases.

Evaluation of Innovative Programs

To ask the question of how evaluation can be used to assess the merits of innovative educational programs, we will focus upon a discussion of the Valley View 45-15 continuous School Year Plan. This plan was described in an article by Robert Beckwith in a recent issue of American School and University. We will attempt to apply the model formulated above to its evaluation.

First of all, we can view the 45-15 plan as a year-round operation of a school district which provides an innovative alternative to the traditional nine-month system. A year-round operating education system can assume any one of many forms in which a school system operates beyond the regular 180-day school term. Regardless of the form the plan assumes, such a year-round system will usually be designed (1) to achieve more efficient expenditure of public funds by making the system accommodate more children, (2) to improve upon existing curricula, or (3) both of these goals. Within this framework, an evaluation of year-round programs should be designed to ascertain the extent of financial savings and the advantages or disadvantages involved in year-round operation of schools.

Since the 45-15 plan is relatively new, we should begin by describing the project briefly and noting some information regarding its merits which have been noted by its advocates. The Valley View School District in Lockport, Illinois, initiated its 45-15 plan in June of 1970. The district, which has five elementary schools and one junior high school, was faced with the need to accommodate an additional 500 children when in fact it was already overcrowded.

The basic plan divides the approximately 6,000 students in four equal groups, each of which attends school for 45 days followed by a 15 day break. Each student is provided with 180 days of school each year by the four cycles. Since the starting date of each group is staggered, only three of the four groups are in attendance at any one time. Children from the same family and neighborhood share the same schedule of attendance. So far, the Valley View District has been able to report the following general advantages. They estimate that by increasing classroom space by 33-1/2 percent the Valley View taxpayers will be saved the construction costs involved in building two new classroom buildings which would otherwise have been necessary. In addition, they anticipate additional savings in operational costs for classroom instructional materials and savings in costs incurred by the district's busses by approximately 25 percent. Further, Beckwith reports additional implications for improvement in such areas as better learning opportunities for slow and fast learners, increases in retention, greater efficiency of school operations, decrease in vandalism, and potential for slowing the rising costs of school operation without decreasing the quality of education offered. As far as his report goes, it serves as an excellent introduction to the 45-15 plan and an initial report on some of the conclusions that have been made.

As Beckwith notes in his report, the Valley View 45-15 plan is a manifestation of increasing interest in the use of school facilities on a yearly basis. Rising costs in education, crowded classrooms, increased pupil mobility, and more leisure time for recreation have caused many people to seek alternative methods of school operation. That is, demands are being placed upon educators to innovate. After two years of study, and after the community was asked to voice its opinion concerning alternative methods of year-round operation, the 45-15 plan was implemented.

Beckwith notes that in the 45-15 plan there is the potential for increased flexibility in curriculum planning. That is, within the current two semester system followed by most schools certain subjects have to be forced into the basic semester pattern. The 45-15 plan allows a more feasible time sequence for incorporating subjects which fit better into a longer or shorter time span. Since there is a shorter vacation time, Beckwith points out, there is less likelihood of study habits breaking and therefore less review time is necessary.

The remainder of the report is concerned either with purely economic consideration or with questions which have social rather than educational implications. For example, Beckwith cites the broader recreational and vacation opportunities which may emerge as a result of families having vacations at different parts of the year. In terms of social implications, there is a possibility of decreased vandalism in that students will spend less time on the streets away from the classroom. Further, when all students are on vacation at the same time, employment opportunities are decreased. Staggered vacation schedules may offset this problem. Finally, the report cites as advantages more efficient internal operations, increased earning opportunities for teachers who may opt to teach a total of 11-1/2 months out of the year, and more efficient use of the district bussing system.

The foregoing discussion of the report on the 45-15 plan is intended merely to be descriptive. In terms of the intent of the report--to provide general information on the project--it is a worthwhile paper. It is not entirely clear what evaluation activities did occur. In all likelihood, an adequate evaluation of the program was planned and conducted and an evaluation report generated. What we propose is to reconstruct the evaluation that might have taken place of this program and to discuss its key elements.

A Model for the Evaluation of Educational Programs

As mentioned earlier, we propose a five-stage model for the evaluation of educational programs. To review, these five stages are:

1. Needs Assessment
2. Program Planning
3. Implementation Evaluation
4. Progress Evaluation
5. Outcome Evaluation

Let us now examine each of the five stages in more detail with reference to the evaluation of the 45-15 plan.

Needs Assessment. From the report concerning the 45-15 plan, it appears that some needs assessment was conducted. For example, the report states that the 45-15 plan emerged from the need to acquire more classroom space in a district which was already overcrowded and which had reached the limits of its bonding power. This reflects a direct need of the community. In addition, the report indicates some concern for the opinions of the community which was, to some extent, consulted before the plan was placed in operation. A thorough needs assessment, however, must be more ambitious and more systematic. As we have said, decision makers are often forced to make choices related to school or program priorities. Given the scarcity of resources within his current situation, a decision maker must select the problem area or areas most in need of attention. This decision is based in large part on the information provided by a needs assessment. The purpose of a needs assessment, therefore, is to state the potential educational goals (preferably in terms of student performance rather than instructional processes), decide which of these are of highest priority, and determine how well the existing program is meeting these objectives. This information is then used by the decision maker to identify the major needs so that he can decide which ones should be attacked. For example, a school superintendent might have a needs assessment conducted in his district to help him decide where educational programs should be developed or improved. To do this, he needs to assess the needs of students, the community, and of society in relation to the current status or accomplishments of the system. Once he has been provided with this information, the decision maker is able to select those problems (objective dimensions) most in need of attention or modification.

Obviously, an important feature of the needs assessment is to state the potential needs or objectives and on the basis of the evaluation information provided to select those most critical to the system. With reference to the 45-15 plan, it appears that the specific objectives were not explicated. Implications such as better learning opportunities and increased learning retention were referred to; but we must ask if these were among the objectives of the plan and, if so, could they not have been stated in terms of concrete learner performance? Again, neither the report as such nor its intention is under attack. We are instead concerned with the discussion of evaluation planning and reporting which is applicable to all educational programs. Perhaps the intention of the 45-15 plan was to develop a program to realize financial gains with no specific insistence upon increased student performance. Perhaps both types of advantage were intended with the emphasis upon financial savings. The point is, simply, that the objectives must be fully explicated during the course of the needs assessment in order that appropriate plans may be developed to meet them.

We have also stated earlier that one of our major concerns is to enlist public support for our activities. This is another important feature of a needs assessment, and one which the 45-15 plan appears to have met. By implication here, we are again concerned with the question of accountability. The question becomes one of what are we to be held accountable for? One way to answer this question is to make more specific the educational outcomes we are seeking and to involve the public in that specification. That is, the public should be involved in this aspect of the evaluation to help us to determine the educational goals with which we should be concerned. This process should involve all the various constituents: students, parents, teachers, administrators, content experts, legislators, and so forth.

It is not appropriate at this time to elaborate how these needs assessment procedures can be adopted. The Center, however, is currently developing an evaluation workshop devoted exclusively to considerations in the conduct of a needs assessment which addresses the questions raised above. Information on these materials may be obtained from the Center's Training Materials Program.

Program Planning. After the information from a needs assessment has been collected and interpreted to identify the most important needs, the second decision area of concern deals with program selection. Again with reference to the report on the 45-15 plan, some program planning appears to have been conducted. That is, the actual implementation of the program was preceded by two years of study, and alternative methods of year-round operation, such as split and double shifts, were considered. The emphasis in program planning, then, is upon making decisions about the kinds of programs or combinations of programs that should be adopted to meet the needs identified in the needs assessment. Thus, a series of decisions are made about how the needs might best be met with the resources available. In this evaluation stage, the evaluator is generally asked to provide information on the possible future impact of the introduction of several alternative programs. During the program planning phase, also, the evaluator will provide advice regarding evaluation requirements for alternative plans, and build into the final plan the procedures necessary for carrying out subsequent evaluations.

When program planning information has been provided, the decision maker must make a judgment as to which program offers the greatest possibility of success within his system. For example, the 45-15 report mentions an additional study to ascertain the effects of the plan on the study habits and advancement of knowledge of the students. If improvement in knowledge were an objective of the plan, this sort of consideration might have been incorporated in program planning. That is, the evaluation design might have been constructed in such a way that data could be collected from a control group within the traditional program structure to serve as a comparison for students in the 45-15 plan. Perhaps this kind of consideration was not appropriate to the Valley View District and its overall plan. We mention it rather as one of the kinds of consideration we are concerned with during program planning evaluation.

Implementation Evaluation. Although the 45-15 report plan mentions implementation, there is no discussion of the degree of success of its implementation. Some questions vital to implementation, however, are referred to in the report, such as general efficiency of internal operations and possible scheduling problems. That is, following the decision to adopt a program, implementation evaluation should focus on whether the procedures specified in the program plan are actually carried out in the intended manner. Thus, it involves the degree to which the program has been adapted properly in the field situation. Typical implementation questions for which evaluation information might be needed are: "Did the instructional materials arrive on time?" or "Are the students that are enrolled in the program the ones for whom the program was intended?" Furthermore, the program selection decision was based on various assumptions about the nature of the student population to be served. If these assumptions are incorrect or are no longer appropriate, then this information must be provided to the decision maker to help him to determine whether it is appropriate to allow the program to continue. What, specifically, did the program conceivers think the 45-15 plan would look like? Did the plan as implemented correspond to the intentions of the program developers?

Progress Evaluation. In the 45-15 report, no specific objectives other than financial savings were mentioned and therefore no concrete information is offered concerning improvement in student performance, if that was one of the objectives of the program. However, a progress evaluation is necessary in that it is aimed at determining the extent to which the program is actually making gains toward achieving its objectives. Since a program may be implemented exactly as planned but still fail to attain its intended objectives, it is necessary to investigate whether the plan was effective in achieving the identified student needs. Here the evaluator provides data on how the program is functioning. For example, in terms of the short-range objectives of the system, such as the intended objective to be achieved at the end of a specific unit of study, what has been the performance of the student group? Are there noticeable unanticipated outcomes, not a part of the original objective for the program but which, nevertheless, ought to be noted as information potentially valuable to the decision maker? Further, it is inefficient to implement a program in the Fall and then wait until Spring to learn that it failed when it might have been improved had corrective action been taken earlier. Decision makers, then, need information about student progress during the course of a program so that if problems develop they can be identified and readily corrected.

At this point, it is important to note certain similarities and differences between implementation and progress evaluations. Both activities may be classified as "formative" evaluations and deal with the extent to which the program is functioning properly. Further, both may lead to decisions regarding possible modifications in the operation of the program. Implementation evaluations, however, are concerned with the extent of congruence between the actual operation of the program and the planned procedures, whereas progress evaluations are concerned with determining the extent to which these procedures are producing the specified gains in student performance. Decisions to modify the program will, of course, rely upon both kinds of information since there may be problems in how the plan is being implemented as well as in the plan itself.

Outcome Evaluation. It is too early at this point for us to guess at any final outcome statements that might be made concerning the effectiveness of the 45-15 plan based upon the material available to us. However, at some time after a program has been introduced into the system and has been properly implemented and modified in line with the difficulties which have been encountered, the decision maker will wish to consider the potential generalizability of the program. Here the evaluator will provide the decision maker with information which he can use to decide if the program should be discontinued, continued in the next school year, or extended into other schools in the district.

These five stages illustrate an evaluation which is applicable to any kind of program and at any level of the educational system. Its explication, again, is not intended to criticize either the 45-15 plan or its report, but rather to elucidate and suggest how that program, or any year-round education program, may be evaluated and reported upon.

As we mentioned in the introduction to this paper, we are concerned with the ideas of educational accountability, educational innovation, and educational evaluation. Implicit in this treatment are two considerations: the ability of the decision maker to make the best decision regarding educational priorities, given the constraints of his actual situation, and his ability to communicate relevant information to his constituency in order to enlist their support. The public will no longer accept the priorities we establish without concrete evidence of the need for these priorities. We can gain their acceptance and ensure the accountability of innovative programs by conducting evaluations as outlined above and reporting on results in such a way as to provide a sound basis for the educational decisions that are made.

18A

EVERYWHERE SCHOOL (SAND)

Jack Dollard

A few communities, both old and new, are working to achieve multiple economies by putting together several alternatives to conventional school building. The concepts of open planning and systems construction, for instance, are being combined with joint occupancy and the findings of other public partners, or with the use of factories, warehouses and rented office space, or with the ideas of open campus, home base schools, and non-school schools.

Most of these combinations of alternatives clearly involve a new relationship between schools and their surrounding community. This mingling of school and community demands comprehensive community planning to ensure that costs are reduced and school space is made more economical. It will best be achieved in urban renewal programs where local communities may be engaged in everything from total clearance and rebuilding to spot clearance and rehabilitation. Any project that involves building substantial quantities of new housing and related facilities (stores, social services, libraries, and schools) is a ripe candidate for these ideas.

The South Arsenal Neighborhood Development Corporation (SAND) is a community group operating in a low-income, black and Puerto Rican section of downtown Hartford, Connecticut. Since 1967, SAND has been negotiating with local anti-poverty agencies, the school system, and state and local civic groups to inaugurate a novel community development and educational plan.

South Arsenal was originally scheduled to be demolished, but its residents decided they did not want their area to be leveled and rebuilt as a high-income housing or commercial development. The residents wanted to remain where they were and rebuild their own community with better housing and better schools.

After a considerable amount of community planning and negotiation with the various agencies involved, SAND developed a radical idea--its elementary school space was to be dispersed in small units throughout the ground floors of the new housing. The school would be "everywhere." Children would be studying out in the immediate neighborhood, in the city, or even in the suburbs.

Basically, this idea has survived and has been approved by the relevant authorities, with one major reservation. Because the Federal Housing Authority has a 15% limitation on community space in its housing (and because school space did not fit its definition of community space), the school space will not be located on the ground floors of the housing. The school will still be dispersed throughout the community; however, most of the school space will occupy its own land, closely integrated with the housing.

Even with this exception, SAND's school space will be testing the notion of putting several alternatives together in order to gain multiple economies.

The basic Everywhere School unit is a multi-instructional area (MIA), a 5,250-sq-ft carpeted, climate-controlled, open space divided by casework and screens. Each MIA is planned to enroll 150 pupils, with 100 in the MIA and the other 50 in what SAND calls "environmental extensions" in other parts of the city and the suburbs. Two environmental extensions are already in operation as part of the school's experimental MIA. Twenty-five children each day now go to school on a rotating basis at a private school in the suburbs. Another 25 spend a day at an art museum in Hartford. The annual cost of busing children to these two locations is $4,000. SAND is exploring the development of other environmental extensions in such places as a nearby private college located in a suburb.

In addition to the children who leave South Arsenal each day, children from each MIA will be using the common facilities of the dispersed school--the gymnasium and swimming pool, the arts center, the theater, and the information resource center or library.

Each piece of the school will form a central part of a "neighborhood commons," the basic unit for the community as a whole. The commons will include housing for 20 to 50 families plus school and community services. There is also an area for retail stores.

The planners of SAND will be using the bulk-purchase, off-the-shelf, approach to systems building both in the housing and the school space. Largely by these methods and by open planning, they are predicting that their school space will come in at no more than $25 per sq. ft. vs. a $35 per sq. ft. average for conventional schools.

The multiple economies of SAND, however, can best be seen in the cost-per-pupil figures. In 1968, the Hartford Board of Education set aside a $4-million bond issue to build a 1,000-pupil elementary school in South

Arsenal. About $1 million of this was for land, architectural fees, etc. leaving $3 million for the actual construction of school space. The estimated per pupil cost of this conventional school was thus $3,000 per student.

The SAND project, however, has taken four years to plan and develop. The Hartford Board now estimates that those four years of inflation have now made it possible to build conventional space for only 750 students under the $3-million bond issue. This would raise the per student cost to $4,000.

Jack Dollard, one of the original planners of SAND and now one of its architects, disagrees. He believes that the Everywhere School will be able to accommodate its full enrollment of 1,200 students for not more than $2.8 million. This would bring the cost per pupil down to $2,300, thus saving $1,700 per student, or more than 40% of the Board's estimate.

This will be possible in part due to the savings from systems building and open planning, but to a much larger degree these savings will come from the way the school is to be operated, in particular from the fact that it is a home base school.

Because SAND is proposing that at any one time one-third of the students (400 children) will not be using the home base facilities, less space needs to be provided than for a conventional school. A total of only 800 children will be using the school space each day. SAND will provide a total of 90 sq. ft. per pupil, including the common facilities, for its 800-students.

By conventional standards, a total of 100 sq. ft. per pupil is about average for a traditional elementary school. This would mean a total allotment of 120,000 sq. ft. for 1,200 children. SAND is proposing to provide only 72,500 total sq. ft., or 40% less space, thus backing up Dollard's estimate of a 40% reduction in cost.

Currently, SAND is using "found" space for an experimental MIA in a local warehouse. The 5,000 sq. ft. warehouse was made available to SAND by the University of Connecticut. SAND spent about $20,000 fixing up the space ($4 per sq. ft.), including fireproofing, carpeting, new lighting, etc., but this low cost was possible because a great deal of the labor and materials were donated by neighborhood people and interested outsiders. SAND hopes to acquire the warehouse as part of the urban renewal package and remodel it into the school's arts center.

Even though the Everywhere School will not be an ideal joint occupancy in mixing housing with schools, it has several other possibilities for joint occupancy.

One possible plan is to have a central kitchen for the school jointly occupying space with housing devoted to the elderly (this would fit under the FHA's definition of community space). The kitchen would supply food services to the MIA's and also provide cafeteria services for the elderly in its building.

Officials of the Hartford Public Library are considering whether it is possible to build a branch in the South Arsenal development. The result might be a partnership structure with the school's information resource center, thus creating a facility useful to the entire SAND community. It could also be more economical than two separate buildings.

In addition, SAND plans that all of the Everywhere School's facilities--the gym, theater, information resources center, etc.--will be available to the adult community in the evenings and on weekends. The MIA's will be used for adult education (especially bilingual education). The planners of SAND believe that this will eliminate the need for a community center costing a minimum of $1 million.

SAND and its Everywhere School is thus attempting to gain multiple economies by combining building systems, open space, finding partners, the home base school, found space, and possibly a small amount of joint occupancy. If the SAND plan materializes as its planners expect it to, the Everywhere School will represent a major change in the way we think about schools and schoolhouses. In addition, SAND will also represent a remarkable breakthrough in schoolhouse economy.

If multiple economies can be achieved in a small-scale project such as SAND, the opportunities for economy should be larger and more numerous in planning new towns and new cities.

18B

IMPLEMENTING THE MULTI-UNIT SCHOOL

Adeline Hartung

Individually Guided Education (IGE) in a multi-unit organization is being tried this year in four Mulwaukee public elementary schools.

Thoreau and Victory are completely organized as multi-unit schools. At Franklin, a cooperative teaching project is continuing in the primary classes to take advantage of the "pod arrangement" of classrooms in the new wing of the school. McKinley, a fifth and sixth grade only school, has classes which are organized on a unitized basis.

IGE is a system of instruction which recognizes the great variation in what each child learns, how rapidly he learns, and differences in how children go about learning. The multi-unit school creates a non-graded environment where IGE practices can be installed and maintained. A unit consists of 120 to 160 pupils, a corresponding number of teachers, a para-professional, and one or two aides.

Four-Step Cycle

IGE is a four-step cycle consisting of (1) assessment, (2) choosing objectives, (3) implementation of a learning program, and (4) reassessment. The cycle is repeated again and again in each subject for each pupil.

The program permits pupils to have learning experiences tailored to individual needs. Pupils operate individually or as members of small groups who have more or less identical needs.

The system involves identification of a set of school-wide objectives and a range of objectives suitable for smaller groups. After assessing each pupil in relation to the objectives, it is necessary to plan and implement instruction in terms of activities, materials, time, and space.

Gains from the new system are two-fold. Pupils are taught at a level and rate, and in a way that is appropriate at any given time. Teachers spend more time diagnosing pupils' needs and helping them to attain them and less time at tasks not directly connected with the instructional program.

The teachers in a unit meet regularly as a team to plan learning experiences for the pupils. The team plans and directs activities not only for the pupils, but also for the teacher aides who assist in small group and individual instruction, preparation of materials, record keeping, and training pupils to use audio-visual hardware and other learning materials which are an integral part of the system. Optimum use is made of teachers, teacher aides, materials, and school space.

IGE programs at the four schools are financed by the board from the program improvement fund.

Multi-unit organization and IGE have been under research and development since 1965. They were pioneered by the Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning at the University of Wisconsin in Madison and tested in Wisconsin school systems and in other states.

19

CHULA VISTA CA: YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL PROGRAM

Burton C. Tiffany

Educators, legislators, and citizens from every walk of life in each of the fifty states are studying and then urging the implementation of year-round school programs. In step with its current needs and the times, the Chula Vista City School District (K-6) designed a year-round school program which began on July 6, 1971 in four of its twenty-six schools; Finney, Silver Wing, Juarez-Lincoln and Los Altos.

A year-round school program is considered by many people as the most educationally sound and economically feasible solution to problems which exist here and in many school districts.

To evaluate the effectiveness of this program, financial assistance from outside the district was secured from the Rosenberg Foundation which approved a grant of $10,000 toward completing a comprehensive evaluation of the year-round school program by November 1972. The plans call for evaluating: (1) The academic achievement of year-round pupils in comparison with the achievement of pupils who attend schools on a traditional calendar; (2) The attitudes of pupils, parents, and staff toward the year-round school program; (3) The effects of spaced vacation and instructional periods upon the retention of subject matter and skills on the emotional health and on student's attitude toward self and school; and (4) The comparative costs of operating schools on the year-round schedule with schools on the traditional calendar.

Although the major changes are ones which affect the "calendar" rather than the "curriculum," it is our feeling that the year-round school program will result in a better educational program for children.

The four schools in the program are located on Otay Mesa, an area in the district that has witnessed a tremendous growth in enrollment: 1965--fewer than 400 pupils; 1971-72--more than 4,000 pupils.

Under the "traditional" calendar, these schools accommodate approximately 3,200 children. There would have been insufficient classroom space to bus the remaining 800 children projected for Otay Mesa to other district schools. Half-day sessions were considered a poor alternative to full-day schooling.

However, by implementing a year-round program, these four neighboring schools are able to accommodate 4,000 children on the Mesa. Each child, as all other children in the district, is able to attend the full 176 days of classes.

Three of these schools are of open space design. Flexibility is not limited by interior walls. Three or six class groups may work in one large area. Children and teachers have easy access to the Library Media Center which has been designed as the "hub" of the school. These are team teaching schools designed to facilitate individualized instruction.

One school is of "traditional" finger plan design. It has a library and all supportive materials needed for a modern program.

HOW WAS THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL PROGRAM DEVELOPED?

When school enrollment projections for 1971-72 exceeded available classroom space, the district faced a housing problem. A year-round school plan appeared to offer a solution. In January 1971, the Board of Education approved a study of the feasibility of such a plan.

A staff task force began to look at the ramifications of a possible year-round school plan. Several meetings were held with the staffs of the Otay Mesa schools to obtain their input. Chula Vista representatives visited the 45-15 programs in St. Charles , Missouri, and Valley View, Illinois. One member also attended the Third Annual Year-round Seminar in Cocoa Beach, Florida.

Six open meetings to discuss the program with parents and residents living on the Otay Mesa were held. Of the more than 700 who attended and indicated their preferences, 70% were in favor of the year-round program, 15% were opposed, but said they would send their children, and approximately 3% indicated they preferred half-day school sessions. With this community support, district personnel worked to design a plan which incorporated suggestions from parents, staff,and other citizens. Late in March of 1971, the Board of Education authorized a year-round plan. It was felt that this was the best solution available to provide students with a complete educational program.

An Ad Hoc Citizens Committee, comprised of parent representatives from each school and of other citizens from the community area, was appointed by the Board of Education to work with district staff in an advisory capacity. School and district staff serve in a non-voting "ex-officio" capacity to this committee. The Citizens Committee continues to review and recommend major aspects of the program, including the calendar, program evaluation, liaison procedures with the community and Board of Education, and recreation programs.

INTERSESSION

Students may voluntarily elect to attend "intersession" classes during any or all of their vacation periods (except during Christmas and Easter vacation periods when all children are out of school). Two portable classrooms at each school provide ample space to house the intersession program. Classes are multi-graded, grades 1-3 and 4-6, and convene daily from 8:30 to 11:30 a. m., or from 12:00 noon to 3:00 p. m. The intersession program utilizes more days than summer school, but by convening for a shorter time each day, approximates the same average daily attendance figure used to compute state financial support. Students are provided with opportunities to reinforce skills previously taught, as well as participate in a diversified program of activities in the areas of social studies, science, arts and crafts, music, and physical education.

THE PROGRAM AND TEACHERS

Many options for length of contract are available. Some teachers continue to work the same number of days as other district staff, but on a year-round basis. Others are working beyond the standard contract, up to twelve school months (238 days) at a prorated increase in salary. Many of the supportive staff members such as the librarian, reading teacher, and special education teacher will work up to 236 days. Extension classes for graduate study continue to be available after school and on weekends.

FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

The year-round program more fully and efficiently utilizes the available materials and facilities. This program requires no additional operating cost per pupil--in fact some small savings are possible. The year-round program requires fewer schools. For each school that the district does not have to build, over $1,000,000 will be saved in land and construction with an additional $1,000,000 saved in bond interest costs. With a projected increase in school enrollment of approximately 7,000 students in the next five years, the construction of 9 schools instead of twelve would mean a savings of over six million dollars.

The year-round school program has been in operation for five months. The ongoing efforts of the Ad Hoc Citizens Committee have provided a vital channel for communication with the Otay Mesa community. As an example of student, parental, and staff support, an informal survey in October revealed that 79% of the students, 88% of the parents, and 89% of the staff favored the year-round school program. They like it and want it to continue!

20

FRANKLIN PIERCE, TACOMA WA: THE 4-1-4-1-1 INTERIM MONTH SYSTEM OF YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL OPERATION

Edward E. Hill

INTRODUCTION

At a retreat for the administrators of the Franklin Pierce School District, held on September 19, 1971, the administrators voted to continue and to expand the interim plan of operation to effect year-around operation of the schools. Because the Franklin Pierce School District does not have a housing problem, and current projections do not call for substantial increases in student population in the next five years, the short range model of year-around education is designed to improve quality and variety of curricular offerings rather than to effect a savings in building usage. The long-range model, to be totally operative by 1976, will increase the total capacity of a school building by about 25%.

DEFINITIONS:

INTERIM is a term meaning alternative programs sandwiched between regular programs.

> At the Elementary Level: Students attend four days of regular classwork, and on the fifth day participate in an alternative education program. This is supplemented by a summer session which duplicates the fifth day courses on an intensive education basis.
>
> Under this plan the student spends 144 days in regular course work, 36 days in alternative education course work during the regular school year, and spends approximately 20 days in summer programs made up of a combination of alternative education courses and basic (close the gap) type of academic courses.
>
> At the Junior High Level: Students attend a four-month semester through January, have a three-week interim in January, continue with a second semester and have a four-week summer term. The terms are the same as the high school plan so that students may participate in high school programs if they qualify.
>
> At the High School Level: Students attend a four-month, 80-day semester ending with the Christmas vacation, spend four weeks in an interim month in January, attend a second four-month semester and complete a four-week interim in July. During the school year, the students participate in departmentalized programs during four days a week, in intensive programs during the fifth day.

FRAGMENTED EDUCATION COURSE, hereafter referred to as an FEC course, is a course offering which is given in conjunction with two or more course offerings in one school day. Fragmented course offerings are found typically in elementary schools and in departmentalized secondary school programs.

INTENSIVE EDUCATION COURSE, hereafter referred to as an IEC course, is a course offering which is given where there are two or less courses offered in a school day. It is the typical offering in an interim month, summer session, and in many fifth-day programs. The IEC course required expensive advance program development and requires a teacher to utilize interactive, reactive, and active learning cycles in each presentation. IEC courses range in length from two to six hours.

THE PLAN:

Initiation of the 4-1-4-1 plan requires extensive program development to identify, develop, and validate the IEC course offerings. Because there are more electives in the IEC course offerings than in FEC course offerings, the total number of courses offered in a typical secondary system will almost double. The following represents the actual and proposed schedule for placing this program into effect in the Franklin Pierce School District.

YEAR #1 - Preplanning - 1968-69. The Principal of Washington High School, with his staff, developed the 4-1-4 plan. Courses to be offered during the interim, and a schematic, outlining the articulation of the interim with the regular school year, was developed.

YEAR #2 - Initial Operation of Interim 4-1-4 - 1969-70. IEC non-credit courses built around student and teacher interests were offered during the interim month. Off-campus classes, including work experience, cultural exchange programs, and international education engaged about 25% of the students. One group participated in a college-level class with Pacific Lutheran University in Italy.

YEAR #3 - Operation of 4-1-4 expansion to other schools and planning for 4-1-4-1 operation - 1970-71. Washington High School continued to expand its interim month concept, and operated its own international education program. All courses were taught in the IEC mode for either three or six hours. The program was studied by other schools in the district as well as by the School Board. At this time, the district was selected, on a nation-wide basis, as one of the three sites to receive an experimental schools grant; therefore, planning was completed to expand the interim operation for the 1971-72 school year to Keithley Junior High School and to Franklin Pierce High School.

YEAR #4 - Operation of the 4-1-4-1 Credit Program - 1971-72. Currently, Washington High School and Keithley Junior High School are operating on the 4-1-4-1 program. Utilizing students and parents, more than seventy secondary staff members developed and validated interim month IEC programs. Franklin Pierce High School developed its own interim month for January. Credit will be granted to Washington High School students for all interim programs, based on 1/2 unit (1 semester credit) for each 60 clock hours the student is under teacher direction.

Brookdale, Collins, Christensen, and Parkland developed fifth-day interim week programs. Under their plan, the schools offer 144 days in traditional courses, 36 days in alternative courses, and a summer program.

YEAR #5 - Proposed Operation of the 4-1-4-1 Plan K-12 and Piloting of the 4-1-4-1 Plan at Washington High School - 1972-73. Collins Elementary School would pilot the 4-1-4-1 plan by changing from the fifth-day program to the interim-month program. Families in the Collins area could elect to take their vacations in January by selecting the interim in July. Because Ford Junior High and Franklin Pierce High School would be on the interim plan, families with students in all three schools could plan common vacation times. Utilizing experimental schools funds, the district will develop an alternative elementary curriculum for this month featuring elective and required academic courses as well as activity courses. Washington High School would develop a two-week program to train gifted students as cross-age-tutors.

YEAR #6, 7, 8 - District-wide adoption of common plan for interim operation - 1973-75. It is expected that the research conducted by the inside and outside evaluators would point to the best direction for interim month operation. At this point in time, it is believed that by May 1975 the total district would be structured as follows:

DISTRICT MASTER CALENDAR - 210 DAYS:

FEC COURSE CALENDAR		FIFTH DAY IEC CALENDAR		INTERIM IEC CALENDAR	
Semester 1	64 Days	Semester 1	16 Days	Winter	20 Days
Semester 2	64 Days	Semester 2	16 Days	Summer	20 Days
				Mini	10 Days
	128 Days		32 Days		50 Days

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT CALENDAR 180 F.T.E. DAYS: Beginning with the 1976-77 school year, the district will operate entirely from local funds. Whereas experimental schools funds would have supported extensions of the school year beyond the 180 days, local funds are geared to financing 180 or less days of F.T.E. education. Because of this, the student would operate in one of three modes:

1. He would attend the entire 200 or 210 days, but attend a shorter school day, so that his F.T.E. days would equal 180.
2. He would attend 180 days selected from the FEC and IEC options.
3. Some students would attend more than 180 days, some less than 180 days, however, the cumulative local support would average 180 F.T.E. days for each student. The basis for attending fewer days would be the ability of certain youngsters to meet program objectives in less than a regular school year, and the need for some students to spend more time in classes.

INDIVIDUAL TEACHER CALENDAR: Teachers would be issued a 180-day teaching contract. Some teachers would teach longer, some shorter periods of time, depending on individual desire and the contract amount increased or decreased on a pro-rated basis.

COST EFFICIENCY

A statistical model is now under development showing the potential building and staff utilization plans. Through counseling and allocation of class time and space, it would be the objective of the project to house not more than 90% of the students at any one time, with a target of 80% to effect a 10% to 20% savings in school facility use.

999 PROGRAM BUDGET CATEGORIES HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED TO "TRACK" THIS PLAN AND INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING BUDGET VARIABLES:

NAME______________________________ I.D.________________

SCHOOL____

PERCENT CHARGE BELOW__________% HOURS PER DAY____________

STUDENT COUNT PER HOUR_____________

TIME PERIOD	INSTRUCTIONAL MODE	CURRICULUM AREA
__0 Curriculum Devl.	__0 Self-Contained-Regular	__0 Communication
__1 Interim-Winter	__1 Self-Contained-Split	__1 Science-Math
__2 Interim-Summer	__2 Individualized-Regular	__2 Fine Arts
__3 Fifth Day	__3 Individualized-Split	__3 Practical Arts
__4 First Semester	__4 Departmentalized-Regular	__4 Voc-Tech
__5 Second Semester	__5 Departmentalized-Team	__5 Phys Ed-Health
__6 Short Year - (165 days)	__6 Pierce County-Individualized	__6 Remediation
__7 Regular Year (180)	__7 Pierce County-Group	__7 Alternative-Academic
__8 Long Year (200)	__8 State/Nation/International	__8 Alternative-Non-Academic
__9 Continuous	__9 Combination	__9 Unspecified

The attached schematic shows how this arrangement might work in a high school setting.

21

DADE COUNTY, (MIAMI) FL: QUINMESTER – EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR PROGRAM

Martin Rubinstein

The Quinmester Extended School Year design was developed around a calendar that divides the school year into five 45-day or 9-week sessions. Pupils in schools operating with the Quinmester organization must attend four (4) quinmesters in the five (5) quinmester school year. The student has the option of attending all five (5) quinmesters and accelerating his graduation from high school or electing a vacation quinmester other than the traditional summer vacation period. Each fifth quinmester attended by the pupil could possibly accelerate his graduation from high school forty-five days although the fifth quinmester may be used by pupils for enrichment and remedial experiences and not result in an accelerated graduation.

This extended school year organization does not radically effect the present operational calendar of the Dade County Schools, and provides the community with the option of an extended school year program while maintaining the present calendar structure for those people in the community who prefer the traditional 180 day school year. The Quinmester Program is designed to be different than the present summer programming in that the summer quinmester is expected to be an extension of the four other terms of the school year and is not considered to be primarily a vehicle for remediation or enrichment. Although these types of programs will be available in quinmester schools, the Quinmester Extended School Year Plan makes available regular school programming throughout the calendar year with the exception of a two-to-three-week summer vacation period. The above average student could accelerate under this plan while other pupils could more easily repeat grades failed. (Gifted and motivated pupils could complete 6 years of secondary schooling in five years by attending four summer quinmesters between grades seven and eleven, while less gifted pupils who did fail grades could get their elementary and secondary school education in the present normal twelve-year period.) The voluntary features of this plan permits those who wish to attend a full year to do so and those who strongly object to being in school for an elongated period attend only the regular 180 day school program.

15

Quinmester Pilot School Involvement

Second secondary schools have been identified as quinmester pilot schools. They are Miami Springs Senior High School, Miami Beach Senior High School, North Miami Beach Senior High School, Nautilus Junior High School, Henry Filer Junior High School, Hialeah Junior High School and Palmetto Junior High School,

All but two of the pilot schools (North Miami Beach Senior High School and Miami Beach Senior High School) offered a quinmester program starting in June, 1971. The other two pilot schools started their first quinmester in September, 1971.

During the 1970-71 school year, the pilot schools were involved in a comprehensive study of the administrative and curriculum implications of the Quinmester Program, through representation on all the subject area advisory committees and the administrative review and steering committee.

The individual pilot schools in addition to writing curriculum support material for the Quinmester Program, conducted a community information dissemination campaign designed to acquaint the community with the Quinmester Extended School Year Program.

Plant Utilization Implications of the Quinmester Extended School Year Program

The Quinmester Plan theoretically has the potential to increase the capacity of school plants by 25%. A school having a capacity of 2,000 pupils could conceivably enroll 2,500 and due to the staggered attendance periods have but 2,000 pupils in attendance during any given quinmester. Increased plant capacity could also be achieved through an acceleration procedure developed under this plan. The fact that the fifth quinmester coincides closely with the Dade County Base Plan for summer school operation is likely to make attendance in summer school for acceleration purposes more appealing. To achieve the maximum benefit from this plan relative to plant utilization 4/5 of the total secondary school population would need to be in attendance each quinmester.

This maximum benefit indicated above could only be achieved by mandating pupil attendance and vacation periods. The Quinmester Extended School Year design, as presently being planned in the Dade County schools does not anticipate this mandatory procedure.

The prevailing patterns of family and community living and working, although presently undergoing change, militate against the acceptance of any extended school year design by the community that assigns pupils to specific attendance sessions for plant utilization purposes. It is anticipated that as community mores and habits change, the number of families that elect to vacation in a period other than the summer will increase and more students will attend fifth quinmester program that affords them the same academic opportunities that are available in the regular school year program.

Attendance statistics from the 1970 six-week summer session indicate that 34% of the potential secondary school population attended an academic summer school for credit. These attendance figures provide some data for a projection of what summer quinmester attendance might become after several years of operation.

It is not projected that attendance at a summer quinmester will always be reflected in an accelerated graduation for students; however, it can be generally assumed that in most cases each summer quinmester attended by a pupil will result in the saving of 25% of a pupil station.

The projection of 3,384 pupils attending quinmester programs during the summer of 1971 could conceivably provide a savings of 846 student stations computed at .25 pupil station per student in attendance. The economic benefits derived from savings in operating costs per pupil between 10-month operation and fifth quinmester operation averages about 1%. The degree to which pupils avail themselves of the acceleration factor in the Quinmester Plan and the degree to which pupils voluntarily elect a vacation period other than the traditional summer months will in effect represent the sum total of the plant utilization benefits available from the Quinmester Plan.

Numerous references and informational items concerning the Quinmester Program have been published in Checkpoint and the school newspapers of the pilot schools. Several of the pilot schools have developed and distributed brochures to their patrons and pupils.

17

Reach for Relevance

Curriculum development is a "grass roots project" because planning has involved hundreds of teachers serving on curriculum committees to decide course content and objectives. Students also have been used in an advisory capacity. Some 1600 educators working with subject area consultants have developed and packaged numerous nine-week courses. All the old basics are there, but many have fresh new titles and approaches. In addition there are new courses representative of the system's reach for relevancy. Some 1300 "quin" titles will be offered in college-like catalogues. Of these, approximately 350 were available this past summer, the full gamut by the summer of 1973.

Under the quinmester plan no longer will a student go to school to take a semester of math or English. Instead, he'll take nine-week "quin" courses in a variety of math topics such as "Practical Statistics" or "Geometric Constructions." English, or language arts, courses will come through as "The Power of Words," "The Art of Satire," "Living Shakespeare," "Suit the Speed to the Road" (reading), "Righting Your Writing," "Rags and Riches in Modern American Literature," and "The Reel Thing."

Some quin course will be sequential. Before a student takes the nine-weeks course "Pre-Algebra 3," for example, he must already have mastered "Pre-Algebra 1" and "2."

Language arts and social studies will join forces in such courses as "You, Too, Can be a Legislator!"; business education and social studies in such courses as "Bull and Bear: The Stock Market," and "Taxes"; science and social studies in such courses as "Ecopolitics."

The Quinmester is receiving close scrutiny, including an initial evaluation this Spring. This and follow-up evaluations will lead to determination of whether the plan should be continued in its present format, redirected or expanded.

Whatever the results, the things that are tried in quinmester schools and the things that happen in them will have far-reaching implications for the rest of the school system.

energy to expend in the summer. Historically, schools shut down so pupils and teachers could work their farms by the use of relatively simple skills. In our faster-changing and moving urban society, our youth are more active and searching. Youth are searching for answers to complex questions about the very foundations of our society and want to become involved in meaningful and relevant activities. If a year-round school system is able to channel the time and energy of our youth into productive, stimulating, and rewarding activities, society would gain, and at the same time our youth are possibly saved from idleness, unrest, and summer juvenile delinquency.

Financial Savings of a Year-Round Calendar

The subject of a year-round school program and its implications are vast. It is extremely naive to believe that a year-round program is easy to visualize fully and easy to implement. There are several different year-round plans. I will discuss what I call the Flexible Calendar plan which is a rotational four-quarter plan. My remarks will be confined to this plan, because of its inherent flexibility and because of the limitations of time.

There are many kinds of implications regarding school calendar plans, such as educational, social, administrative, cultural, operational, economic, and financial. A great deal has been said and written about these various implications. I shall focus attention here on the financial implication, not that the other implications are not important, but because very little in terms of rigorous financial analysis has been applied to the subject of year-round school plans.

For illustration purposes, let us examine the effect on annual expenditures for a school district which shifts from a traditional calendar to the Flexible plan. Some types of expenditure items will decline, some will decline more than others, some will remain unchanged, and some will increase. Inasmuch as the budgets vary from one district to another in terms of cost levels of various budget items and in terms of their proportions in the total budget, likewise the cost savings and cost increases from the Flexible plan will vary from district to district. This variation is expected on the basis of differences in priorities, goals, local conditions, and many other circumstances.

Changes in budget items are also a function of a time dimension. There are the pre-implementation costs; that is, the costs of planning and preparing for conversion to the year-round program. There are the transitional cost effects during the transitional period. The transitional period is the time interval during which the school operations are adjusting to the year-round plan. During the initial stage of the transitional period, the total expenditure level might be expected to either go up or remain unchanged before it eventually decreases as financial savings gradually begin to materialize.

22

ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

W. Scott Bauman

General Economic and Social Consequences of the Traditional School Calendar

Six significant modern day socio-economic problems are associated with the American traditional school calendar.

1. Annual expenditures for public education have increased rapidly and continuously in the post-war period. We are spending more for education in the aggregate, and on a per pupil basis, and as a proportion of our total economic resources than ever before in history. Some expect these trends to continue in the future. If it is true that the costs of utilizing manpower and physical facilities in public education are at a record high, an argument may be made that not using or underutilizing this manpower and other resources during a significant portion of each year leads to a record high in economic and financial waste.

2. Schools are unable to insure a high quality educational program in the face of a serious shortage of school revenues. Because of considerable competition and demand for our resources in other sectors of society, such as for national defense, welfare assistance, public services, ecology, public safety, housing, transportation, etc., future increases in school revenues are resisted by the public. One way to make quality improvements in our educational system is to utilize more efficiently the revenues, manpower, and facilities which are available to our schools.

3. With the onrush of the knowledge explosion and the technological revolution, the potential opportunities through public education have never been greater for each citizen to acquire knowledge, develop skills, and formulate personal values, with the objective of enjoying a higher standard of living and social well-being. How well citizens reap the rewards from this stockpile of knowledge is dependent upon their access to it. A year-round school system can open a door to those students who can profit from a greater investment in knowledge and skill development.

4. A common root to poverty among our lower economic classes is the lack of suitable vocational and academic educational opportunities. If only a portion of the wasted manpower and facilities of schools under the traditional school calendar were diverted to economically and educationally disadvantaged citizens, the attack on the roots of poverty could be intensified.

5. The traditional school calendar is incompatible with life in a modern, complex, urban society. The minds and bodies of our youth today have more time and

Then, there are the long-run cost effects; that is, the changes in expenditure levels after a school district has completed the adjustment to a year-round school program. Depending on local conditions, it will take anywhere from two to twenty-five years for a district to make the full adjustment. The long-run cost effects are divided into two phases for analytical purposes. Phase I reflects the annual level of costs and savings for a district after the completion of long-run adjustments and for a school system which is providing the same quality and quantity of educational services each year as it did before conversion.

Phase II reflects the annual level of costs for a district after long-run adjustments and after the savings from a year-round program are put to use. These savings may be put to use by expanding programs, by improving programs and operations, and by reducing taxes. How these savings are used depends on school priorities and local conditions.

My analysis will concentrate on the long-run effects in Phase I. Table A reflects the level of estimated expenditures for the 1970-71 year of an "average" school district with an enrollment of 10,000 pupils. It is "average" only in the sense that the budget items reflect the estimated national average expenditures per pupil.[1] Let us now examine the changes in each major cost item and the underlying assumptions in this hypothetical school district under the Flexible system.

In conclusion, it is quite clear that a year-round school calendar plan may provide a wide variety of benefits in the form of better educational services, a stronger society, as well as a more efficient allocation of human and capital resources within the American economy.

---

[1] Source: School Management, January, 1971.

Table A

School Expenditures, 1970-71

	Traditional Calender			Long Run Effects - Phase I Flexible Calendar		
	Aggregate (I)	Per Pupil (II)	Percent of Tot. (III)	Aggregate (IV)	Percnt Change (V)	Dollar Change (VI)
(A) Administration	$ 253,000	$ 25.30	3.3%	$ 255,500	+ 1.0%	+$ 2,500
1. Profess'l salaries	115,000	11.50	1.5	116,200	1.0	1,200
2. Clerical salaries	76,200	7.62	1.0	77,000	1.0	800
3. Other	61,800	6.18	0.8	62,400	1.0	600
(B) Instruction	$5,063,500	$506.35	65.2%	$4,572,400	- 9.7%	-$491,100
1. Classroom teacher Sal.	4,042,200	404.22	52.1	3,635,600	-10.0	- 406,600
2. Other profess'l Sal.	536,700	53.67	6.9	479,500	-10.0	- 57,200
3. Clerical salaries	142,800	14.28	1.8	128,500	-10.0	- 14,300
4. Textbooks, materials	260,300	26.03	3.4	247,300	- 5.0	- 13,000
5. Other	81,500	8.15	1.0	81,500	N.C.	- 0 -
(C) Operation	$ 580,000	$ 58.00	7.5%	$ 537,800	- 7.3%	-$ 42,200
1. Custodian salaries	324,600	32.46	4.2	301,900	- 7.0	- 22,700
2. Heat	68,600	6.86	.9	52,800	-23.0	- 15,800
3. Other utilities	115,500	11.55	1.5	113,200	- 2.0	- 2,300
4. Other expenditures	71,300	7.13	0.9	69,900	- 2.0	- 1,400
(D) Maintenance	$ 193,500	$ 19.35	2.5%	$ 183,800	- 5.0%	-$ 9,700
1. Maintenance salaries	71,400	7.14	0.9	67,800	- 5.0	- 3,600
2. Other	122,100	12.21	1.6	116,000	--5.0	- 6,100
(E) "Fixed" charges	$ 513,500	$ 51.35	6.6%	$ 466,700	- 9.1%	-$ 46,800
1. Retirem't, fringe benefits	380,000	38.00	4.9	346,500	- 8.8	- 33,500
2. Insurance & Other Chgs.	133,500	13.35	1.7	120,200	-10.0	- 13,300
(F) Health and other services	$ 66,500	$ 6.65	0.9%	$ 66,500	N.C.	- 0 -
(G) Transportation	$ 286,800	$ 28.68	3.7%	$ 286,800	N.C.	- 0 -
1. Salaries	113,400	11.34	1.5	113,400	N.C.	- 0 -
2. Other	173,400	17.34	2.2	173,400	N.C.	- 0 -
(H) Total Current Expenditures	$6,956,800	$695.68	89.6%	$6,369,500	- 8.4%	-$587,300
(I) Debt service (principal & interest payment-bldg)	$ 645,000	$ 64.50	8.3%	$ 567,600	-22.0%	-$ 77,400
(J) Capital outlays (equipment)	$ 160,100	$ 16.01	2.1%	$ 140,900	-22.0%	-$ 19,200
(K) Total Expenditures	$7,761,900	$776.19	100.0%	$7,078,000	- 8.8%	-$683,900

23A

DEVELOPING A PLAN FOR A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Ruben Rochin

The Extended School Year feasibility study in Keene, New Hampshire, is funded through an ESEA Title III technical assistance grant. It has as its objectives:

1. To conduct a needs assessment in the Keene community focusing upon learner-oriented needs that can help make education more relevant as it relates to different school organization patterns.

2. As a result of a survey of the Keene community in regard to their variance of definition of the Extended School Year and in regard to their opinion of having a new school term organized in the Keene community, there will be a more favorable attitude by the community at large to move toward an Extended School Year pattern.

3. To compile a review of research on different structures of school patterns and upon variables influencing the success of new and innovative school year patterns and to disseminate these to appropriate target groups, particularly to New Hampshire at large.

4. To develop an implementation model with cost analysis comparisons and implementation strategies and to present to the Keene community a two-sided argument pursuing the pros and cons of Keene's moving to an Extended School Year.

The related activities are:

1. The Project Staff will conduct a series of informal interviews with a small sample (one or two members) taken from several groups who hypothetically may have different reactions to changes in the school year structure (teachers, pupils, community leaders, businessmen, parents, etc.).

2. The concerns and questions expressed in the above interviews will be formulated into a list of educational needs which may be affected by a change in the structure of the school year, a list of potential Extended School Year plans, and possible implementation routes, and a summary chart of opinions concerning needs and the potentials of an Extended School Year plan held by varying groups within the community.

3. The above two lists and the summary chart will be used in selecting the sample to be surveyed. The variety of opinions will be used in

choosing blocking variables upon which to select a 1% sample to which the questionnaire will be given.

4. From the two lists the instrument in the form of closed-ended questionnaires will be developed in order to assess the educational needs of the area, to solicit opinions of how these needs are related to the length and structure of the school year, to get information on the priorities of these needs to specific subgroups, to estimate reactions to changes in the school year structures, and to gather information upon perceived strengths and weaknesses of the school program.

5. Select a 1% random sample from the following target groups: a) the economically disadvantaged; b) the economically affluent; c) parents; d) teachers; e) students; f) natives; g) new families; h) persons with leadership roles (Mayor, Chamber of Commerce, etc.); i) college community; j) industry.

6. Administration of written questions to the 1% random samples of each of the above target groups and either an adequate (80%) return or a non-respondent follow-up will be completed by telephone or live interview.

7. The responses will be summarized and a more specific instrument will be derived from the results.

8. The new written instrument will then be administered to a different 1% sample selected across the same blocking variables as were used for the previous sample and either an adequate (80%) return or a non-respondent follow-up will be conducted by telephone or live interview.

9. The results will then be published in the Keene Evening Sentinel, the Keene Shopper News, through small group presentations by the Project Director or his staff to service organizations, radio and television programs, so as to gather mass reactions and verification of them.

10. Results of these reactions in the form of frequency tables and commentary will then be summarized to complete the first two objectives.

11. Simultaneous with the above activities being conducted on the needs assessment and opinionnaire, the staff will also survey reviews of educational research, the ERIC files, PREP, as well as other research available from State Title III Directors throughout the country for information upon Extended School Year programs.

12. Summarize and make ready for presentation both the research and theoretical information above.

13. Make presentation of the above review of the research findings to the Executive Committee, the Advisory Council, the School Board, school administration, community leaders, and the community at large. (See Activity 9 for mass media dissemination activities.) This literature review should satisfy the third and fourth objectives.

In analyzing this data we will be looking for the following: 1) huge differences in response; 2) any differences in how to communicate orally with people (ways of couching the same question in different terms); 3) varying levels of interest and involvement (what turns the respondents on and/or off); 4) additional concerns. After the above has been compiled into a list of needs which may be related to ESY, a more refined set of characteristics related to ESY will be the basis for developing a chart showing anticipated opinions of certain target groups. The first instrument will be put together along a format similar to the one used by the New Hampshire State Department of Education in their Educational Needs Survey or along the lines of the instruments used by the Assessment of Critical Educational Needs in the State of Tennessee (the State of Tennessee Department of Education) or a combination thereof. The written instrument will include varying levels of communication for groups having different levels of knowledge about ESY. This written questionnaire will be mailed to a 1% sample to be selected in the following manner:

1. Collection of disadvantaged families by listing the poverty area streets in Keene, counting their results, totaling the group, and choosing a 1% random sample using the house numbers.

2. Collection of economically affluent families to be compiled from individual families as opposed to streets, totaling the groups, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each individual family.

3. Collection of parents to be compiled from school rolls at each of the schools, totaling the groups, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each pair of parents.

4. Collection of teachers to be compiled from the school records of each school, totaling the group, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each teacher.

5. Collection of students to be compiled from the school rolls at each of the schools, totaling the groups, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each student.

6. Collection of natives of the community to be compiled from the City's historical records, totaling the group, and choosing a 1% random

sample from number assignments of each native family.

7. Collection of new families in the community to be compiled from the city records, totaling the groups, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each individual family.

8. Collection of leaders of the community chosen from municipal organizations and elected offices, totaling the group, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each individual leader.

9. Collection of members of the college community to be compiled from the records of the college, totaling the group, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignment of each individual member.

10. Collection of representatives of the industry of the community to be compiled from the Keene Economic Base Study, totaling the group, and choosing a 1% random sample from number assignments of each business.

The data will be brought back and the results will be summarized into closed-ended questionnaires that deal with the principles that relate to ESY and the issues involved. Care will be taken in the choosing of the samples to eliminate any overlap. For example, a teacher that is in a low economic area category would be used in the teacher area rather than in the low economic category; that is to say, we would be going to the referent group most closely related to ESY. The second questionnaire will be much more specific so that the questions will yield high priority (to be decided from incidence of same response). It will be given to a different 1% sample in order to verify previous findings and obtain a consensus report of priorities and information that would determine the plight of ESY. Both sampling studies will be followed up by telephone or live interviews with the missing respondents if less than 80% is returned. These results will be published in the Keene Evening Sentinel and the Keene Shopper News for mass reaction to them. From the 20,000 plus the neighboring communities of Chesterfield, Harrisville, Marlborough, Nelson, and Westmoreland the respondents will be asked to return by mail their concurrence or disagreement with the findings and to indicate their name and address.

23B

DEVELOPING, IMPLEMENTING, AND ANALYZING A SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Robert B. McCarter

Need for Feasibility Studies

The proposed plans for extending the school year are taking many forms for many reasons. The various groups of people that comprise the school community may evaluate these plans and give significantly different priorities to the reported advantages and disadvantages. Responsible school authorities should know the extent to which these are considered important by board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, pupils, and community leaders.

School board members need information regarding educational, financial, and community concerns pertaining to the various designs for restructuring the school year. More specifically, they need information to determine the potential effect on general administration; curriculum; school-life activities; morale and welfare of pupils and teachers; and relationships of school with parents, employers, community agencies, and the State Department of Education.

School boards and administrators should explore programs that increase their school system's accountability to the public. Before the concept of all-year schools is accepted or rejected, a comprehensive feasibility study should be made. It seems very unlikely that any nationwide pattern can or should be adopted. While proponents of twelve-month schooling are stressing potential economics and criticizing school authorities for the waste of idle buildings, staff, and student bodies, educators have failed to take the offensive to back their claim that the fundamental deterent to year-round education has been the refusal of the public to accept the plan.

The empirical evidence which is currently available regarding the potential support for twelve-month schools appears to be inadequate to guide school board action.

A feasibility study for a year-round school program should be predicated on the basic assumption that the district has, or will obtain, information regarding the potential growth in enrollments and the projected capital, instructional and administrative costs and the anticipated sources and amounts of revenue.

The study should be designed to help answer the following: Is a change in the length of the school calendar necessary or desirable to meet current and future needs of the district? If so, what plan would be best?

Feasibility of an extended school year is determined best by evaluating two major factors. These are the ability of the district to organize and administer the program successfully--including the revision of curricula and the utilization of staff, facilities, and funds; and the readiness and willingness of the people involved to accept the concept and to cooperate with the implementation of a new plan.

Specifically, a feasibility study will attempt to: (1) identify the major plans for extending the length of the school year which has been proposed in the literature; (2) ascertain the educational, financial, and social aspects of each of the selected plans; and (3) develop a method that can be used to determine how important these features of the various plans are to those individuals whose support a school board would like to have if an extended school year program were to be adopted for their district.

The survey instrument should be designed to cover only one of the major phases of a comprehensive feasibility study, the determination of the probable acceptability of a program of year-round education--as indicated by opinions relative to the need for, the readiness to accept and the willingness to support an all-year school calendar. The other essential factor, the determination of the ability of the district to organize and operate an extended school year successfully, will not be included. Thus, the study should not be designed to foster support for extended school year plans in general or for any one specific plan. In addition, the study should be sampled as widely as possible using students, parents, teachers, administrators, business and industry officers, and non-parent taxpayers as respondents.

To be certain of a large return the format and appearance of the survey form should be professional looking and reflect the significance of the topic. The length and number of questions should be kept to a minimum to achieve their purpose. Anonymity and a summary should be promised. A stamped, self-addressed envelope should be provided.

Preparation and Analyses of Data

The survey results should be categorized and reported to include comparison of the responses of each group (e.g., students) with every other group of the same district (e.g., parents, teachers, administrators, etc.). These comparisons will be made for both the priority ranking of the plans described and for the opinions about the reported advantages and disadvantages.

A well-done, well-accepted survey can expect the following results: Information will be developed which can serve as a guide to school officials at the district and county level. These kinds of information should be beneficial to laymen in developing a better understanding and appreciation of problems and potential decisions confronting school officials. Regardless of whether or not a school district moves away from the traditional 180-day school term to a plan which utilizes the staff and the facilities for a greater number of calendar days, there is a great need for a better public relations program to justify the position of the school district on this issue. Valuable information should be forthcoming from a study of this nature to reinforce the school board's decision. The study should identify at the same time other areas of concern to school administrators and directors which may need to be researched before rational decisions can be made regarding potential changes in the school-year calendar. Certain aspects of the information to be gathered should be helpful to districts in effecting improvements in their present programs, even if a major change to another plan of school-year organization is not supported by the evidence which is presented in the study.

Any program developed or expanded by a district must conform to school law or the law must be changed by legislation. It is conceivable that research of the nature of the study could identify and, to a degree, support areas of the school code which may need modifying. Specifically, reference is made to regulations concerning compulsory attendance, number of school days, length of the school day and year, transportation, retirement system, and reimbursement formulas as they should relate to extended school year programs. School boards might look more favorably upon rescheduling the school year if legislation permitted and gave financial support to a particular plan the public and the professional staff of a district advocated. Furthermore, if the results of the study indicate that some form of extending the school year is desirable, there may be improved opportunities for obtaining state and ederal funds to help defray the costs of an experiment to plan and reorganize the curriculum and administration of the schools. The basic procedures and some of the results of the study should be relevant to other school systems which may contemplate similar research.

23C

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S ROLE: THE MICHIGAN EXPERIENCE

Bob R. Sternberg

The impetus for the Michigan Department of Education to give active consideration to the extension of the regular school year came via a legislative appropriation of $100,000 made in the 1968 session. It should be noted that it was strictly initiated by the Legislature itself, without the aid of influence by school or departmental lobbyists. In fact, it was born out of an informal session of a few legislators discussing the many problems of school finance.

The specific wording that appeared as a line item in our departmental budget was as follows:

> "Grants to school districts for feasibility studies to be conducted by districts for extending the regular school year beyond the present required amount of time, no one district's grant to exceed $20,000. No grants shall be made for summer school programs. Grants shall be made in accordance with rules of the State Board of Education."

Rules were promulgated, hearings held, and the rules were finally approved by the State Board of Education on December 10, 1968. Application notices were sent to local school district superintendents on December 18, 1968, to submit proposals by January 17, 1969. Forty-seven proposals were received.

The criteria used in selection of school districts to receive study grants were:

1. Geographical distribution.
2. Different types of communities.
3. Different sizes of school districts.
4. Different ESY designs.
5. Different needs, purposes, assumptions considered.

The review process included three independent readings of each proposal. Several staff members participated as readers. Out of this procedure six studies were selected for recommendation to the State Board of Education which approved all six for funding. Grants were awarded to the school districts of

Ann Arbor, Freeland, Northville, Port Huron, Utica, and Okemos, East Lansing and Haslett cooperating in one study.

Each school district was brought in for a review of its projected study so that all of us involved had a clear understanding of study expectations.

During the latter part of May, 1969, the department conducted a two-day workshop on the Extended School Year specifically designed to be of resource value to the personnel of the funded districts. Mr. Reid Gillis, then Assistant Superintendent of the Fulton County Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, and Dr. George Thomas, then from the New York State Department of Education, were utilized as resource persons for this workshop. Invitations were also sent to those districts that had submitted proposals but were not funded to send one representative to this workshop. This was the best reward the department could provide in acknowledgment of their pursued interest and concern in the ESY concept.

A second workshop was held in late September, 1969, in which Reid Gillis and selected members of his staff were utilized as resource persons. Fulton staff members met with small groups of their counterparts from the ESY study districts to discuss the specific problems and means of resolving them in the areas of:

1. Curriculum Revision
2. Programming and Scheduling
3. Administration and Finance
4. Maintenance and Transportation

As the feasibility studies progressed during the 1969-70 school year, it became apparent that additional time would be necessary between the completion of the ESY studies in June, 1970, and some future point in time of going operational on a pilot basis. The Legislature was contacted and accepted the reality of the several factors that would cause this delay. In order to keep the ESY concept moving toward going operational, they appropriated an additional $87,000 for the continuation of five of the six original studies for the 1970-71 school year.

Among the significant outcomes from the first year of ESY studies were recommendations for changes in legislation considered necessary before the ESY concept could become a viable option for local school districts. Two prototype bills were developed. One was an omnibus bill which would modify several appropriate sections of the School Code. This bill has become known as the "no money" bill - House Bill 4885. The second bill (House Bill 4886) would have modified the State School Aid Act. It was designed to provide additional funding to ESY school districts and lay the legal basis for changing Child Accounting Rules and Regulations.

The no-money bill (HB 4885) at this date passed the House with only four "No" votes and currently rests in the Senate Education Committee. This bill introduces the use of the term "Instructional Time Unit" which includes but is not limited to a term, semester, trimester, or quadrimester.

It also provides for allowing kindergarten children to enter school on the first day of the next scheduled instructional time unit after their fifth birthday.

It also provides for modifying the 180 days of instruction for ESY districts. It provides for 180-day equivalency and changes the language to distinguish between 180 days of student instruction separate from a school district operating 180 days of instruction.

It also provides that no student shall be absent for more than two consecutive segments of the school district's established calendar.

The "money bill" (HB 4886) met a sad fate in last year's session but not in the ordinary way of being defeated.

The legislature must act on bills submitted by the Governor first. Not being in favor of the Governor's State Aid Bill, the legislature looked for an existing bill already in the hopper that had made some reference to State School Aid. Our bill number was selected and became known as the Senate's Substitute State Aid Bill which eventually became the vehicle for our current State Aid Act. Needless to say, the original intent of the bill was completely forgotten. This means of course that we start anew in this 1972 session.

Throughout all of this legislative activity the cooperation between the department and the administrators of the ESY study districts has been very close.

If I were to make any recommendations out of my experiences in coordinating ESY feasibility studies to other state department personnel, it would be the following:

1. Select districts where there are superintendents and supporting administrative staff that are deeply committed to the whole ESY concept.

2. Select districts where the motivations for pursuing the ESY idea are tilted more for the improvement of educational quality than for economic efficiency.

3. Select districts in which the relationships between administrators and teachers are positive; i.e., where conflicts are manageable and where the community response to its schools is positive or at least not seriously negative.

4. It really requires at least one-half time of a department consultant if full functioning of coordination is to be provided in a meaningful way. Even more resources from a state department are needed in the transitional phase between study completions and the point of local districts going operational on an ESY basis.

24

YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL AND THE EDUCATIONAL AUDIT

John M. Huffman

The independent educational accomplishment audit is another facet of educational accountability. The concept of the educational audit, although not totally unlike the approach to the fiscal audit, is a new and separate entity in education. Along with the implementation of the program budget and the definition of goals and objectives, management by objectives, and comprehensive evaluation, the independent educational accomplishment audit is soon to take its place as an extremely important vehicle for assuring accountability in education. The educational audit seems to have some very special implications for year-round school and the necessary quality control which must be continually implemented in monitoring the instructional programs which will be conducted in the year-round school curriculum.

There must be a means for administrators and community members to gain feedback on the effectiveness of instruction in the year-round school program, for evaluating the quality of education carried out, to ascertain that the educational program being carried out is, in fact, as described in the written courses of study and curriculum guides that will be implemented in year-round instruction.

The process for the audit which seems to have been accepted by the U.S. Office of Education is as follows:

The potential auditor of the program should be called in to review the planning for any given instructional program, to view the goals for the program, to comment on the appropriateness of the objectives that are developed to support the goals, and to give his approval. If he cannot approve them, then he should give a number of alternative suggestions which program planners might choose from to modify the program to make it conform to a better planned program and one which will stand evaluation and audit. After this initial introduction to the program, the planning should be completed and the plan for the program should be submitted to the person or agency who will be conducting the evaluation of the program.

It is expected then that these persons or agencies will produce an evaluation plan. The evaluation plan will be based on the performance objectives which are developed, with the character of the instructional program and of the participants and the implementers taken into consideration. The evaluation plan should spell out exactly what evaluation instruments will be used; how they are to be constructed if this is to be done locally; how and when they will be utilized; and, in general, what type of research oriented pattern of evaluation will be carried out in order to determine effectiveness of the planned program.

After this evaluation plan has been submitted to the planners or the project managers, then it should be forwarded to the intended auditor. The auditor takes the responsibility then to become completely familiar with the planned program and any federal or other legal guidelines to which the program must conform. Then he must evaluate or judge the appropriateness of the evaluation plan with respect to all these criteria and with respect to his judgment of the appropriateness of the evaluation plan. The auditor, therefore, must be quite familiar with program planning techniques, the analysis of appropriateness of the evaluation instruments, and general research techniques, so that he may most efficiently and accurately write an opinion of the evaluation plan and its appropriateness to the program or project.

The audit plan is likely to include a schedule of program visitations, the specifications of sampling techniques that the auditor will use in order to check or certify the evaluation, the number of completed test materials gathered by the evaluator that the auditor will want to personally check, and the degree to which the auditor will refigure any quartile or percentile ratings in the data analysis. In short, the auditor will recheck and verify each activity of the evaluation plan as carried out by the evaluator. The auditor will accept the responsibility for complete objectivity regarding the project. The evaluator is expected to provide continuing ongoing information to project or program management so that modifications in the program can be made as needed. The auditor must check on the accuracy and the quality of the work done by the evaluator and provide ongoing certification to the project manager and to the local superintendent or officer in charge of administering the entire program. The auditor will want to check programs to see that they are as described in the proposed written plan. He will want to interview teachers or aides, children or parents of children who are involved with the program, in order to confirm the nature of the program which is being carried out. He will want to confer with the director and the evaluator and in short use any techniques which will enable him to feel confident about legally verifying the evaluation of the project.

The general pattern of the federal program audit requires an interim audit visit and an interim audit report submitted at mid-year. In this way, the project manager and the superintendent can get some certification of the progress being made in the program and any developing trouble spots can be identified and pointed out so that modifications may be made if there seem to be problems developing. There will be another audit visit to the project at the end of the year, preferably during the time final evaluation is being conducted, so that the auditor can sample the evaluation instruments and monitor the evaluation process. He will then want an opportunity to conduct some testing on his own and interviewing, if the evaluator is also interviewing, to verify these facets of the evaluation. The audit will include a final written report which will have to be based on the direct evidence gathered by the auditor through his visits plus his survey of evaluation data and his rechecking of data analysis. The final audit report will give the project manager, the local education agency, and any funding agency which may be involved, a positive certification of the quality of the program that has been conducted and the validation of reports made by the evaluator.

This is basically the picture of the auditing activity. Is it clear how this kind of activity could serve to bring assurance to the administrator of the year-round school regarding his program? Audit teams need to be independent of the local program. It is my suggestion that either private consultants, or perhaps county office people, could be trained and utilized as educational auditors in the year-round school. It might even be possible where the year-round school is being conducted in only part of the schools of a district that professionals from other schools in the same district, who did not help to plan the program and who are not helping to implement the program, could serve as auditors and could provide this verification of appropriateness of activity in the year-round school program.

The auditor must not be confused with the evaluator, however. It is the job of the evaluator to assess pupil progress and to gather management decision-making data from the ongoing program. It is the task of the auditor to monitor this kind of data-gathering and to monitor the program that is being conducted in order to provide positive verification from an outside, uninvolved agency so that information given to the superintendent or to the manager will be clearly an unbiased, independent opinion. It should be remembered that the overriding purpose of the educational audit is to contribute to the development of the concept of educational accountability and, therefore, to see to it that children get the best possible education from every program in which they are expected to participate.

26

ROCHESTER PA: ROCHESTER AREA OPTIONAL FOUR QUARTERS

Matthew Hosie

The Rochester Area School District is located along the Ohio River approximately twenty-five miles below Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It is in the heart of the industrial valley stretching from Pittsburgh to East Liverpool, Ohio. Because of its location in Beaver County, the Rochester area has been referred to as the "hub." Main highway and rail routes cross the river at or near Rochester.

The population of the school district numbers approximately 11,000 residents and many ethnic groups are represented in this figure. The population growth of the area has been holding fairly constant over the past few years. A decline of the population has occurred in the Borough of Rochester, the oldest community in the school district, but this decline has been offset by a gain in neighboring Rochester Township. The other municipality, East Rochester Borough, has experienced no great change in population figures.

Geographically, the school district covers approximately five square miles. The terrain is hilly with few flat surface areas. Industrial and commercial ventures are located near the shore of the Ohio and Beaver Rivers and, as one would proceed away from the rivers, residential areas are predominant. The greater the distance away from the rivers, the greater the decrease in density of population. The outer edges of the Rochester Area School District are approximately two miles from the river.

In 1960, the Rochester Borough received funding through the Urban Renewal program and, as a result, launched a massive effort to revitalize the commercial importance of the community. Large retail shopping centers and a highway network were located and this served to challenge the community to do "great and better" things.

Accordingly, the school district set forth to restructure its educational program to meet the challenges of the times. Even though school authorities were hampered by limited, antiquated, and overcrowded facilities, meaningful and significant changes did occur. The high school abandoned the "academic, commercial, general" track programs and instituted instead programs leaning to nongradedness. Modular scheduling was also introduced. Most important, however, an awareness and interest to change educational opportunities were aroused in the school and community.

In 1966, this interest received a boost when the federal government announced the ESEA Title III Project to fund innovative and challenging programs in education. Accordingly, the district filed for and received approval for its project, and this grant launched the district into a study to restructure its entire curriculum K-12 and to plan for new facilities which were needed to accommodate the emerging educational program.

With the willingness of the communities and the school district to respond to the challenge of improvement, coupled with the knowledge and information of new national educational trends and methods supplied through the efforts of ESEA Title III, the school district from 1966 to the present date has restructured its entire curriculum K-12 and has built a new "education complex" designed to house the new programs. Its decision to expand operations "all year round" came only after the restructuring of the curriculum and the construction of a new modern facility made it virtually impossible to take any other course. The educational program, its services, and the facilities were now flexible enough to accommodate any change in the organization of the school year and, as a result, the school district in September, 1971, in order to gain more flexibility in time, instituted the four-quarter plan of operations to replace a traditional two-semester system.

The traditional school year for children in Rochester called for 180 days of required attendance. This is in agreement with state regulations. These regulations were made more flexible a few years ago when Pennsylvania relaxed the requirement of 180 days of instruction and substituted in its place a minimum of 990 hours of instruction for secondary students and 900 hours for elementary from July 1 to June 30.

Prior to September, 1971, all children were required to attend school for 180 days; the school year was divided into two semesters with the first semester beginning approximately September 1 and ending late in January. The second semester and the school year usually ended the first week of June. Scattered throughout the school year were the traditional holidays for Veterans Day, Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, and usually one or two inservice days.

Recognizing that parents were concerned about any change in the school calendar that would affect their normal and routine yearly patterns--holidays, vacations, work schedules, etc.--the district adopted a 240-day school calendar that basically held to the traditional operations yet permitted greater flexibility at the school level. "Feedback" to the school from the community several years ago indicated that any change in the calendar must be gradual and must show the community that this flexible school year program also permitted greater flexibility for parents to break away from their routine schedules as well. The decision to implement the 60-day quarter concept also was based on the fact that attendance records for the district as outlined by the state were kept on 60-day blocks of time; a credit of work at the high school level was usually based on 120 clock hours of instruction and this number could be divided into three equal smaller units. Experience also had shown that more could be accomplished in shorter blocks of time than in the longer.

Accordingly, the following school calendar was adopted for the 1971-72 year.

First Quarter - August 30 - November 23
Second Quarter - November 24 - March 2
Third Quarter - March 7 - June 1
Fourth Quarter - June 5 - August 25

Normal holidays were maintained and an additional "break" was provided between the second and third quarters.

All students were required to attend the first three quarters for the 1971-72 school year and the fourth quarter was optional. Beginning in 1972-73, however, students must attend any three quarters. This was done to permit the district to move slowly into extended-year operations. For this reason, the district has named its extended school year the "three plus" plan. Students must attend any three quarters and they may also elect to attend any portion or all of an additional quarter.

The major objective of the extended operations is to permit and encourage greater learning experiences for all children of the district. As mentioned, in 1966, the Rochester Area School District was awarded a Title III ESEA grant that made it possible for the district to study and implement new content and procedures in its educational program. Prior to that time, the high school program was to a degree nongraded and was offering semester-length courses in the academic areas of English and Science. With the assistance of the federal grant under Title III, the district undertook a complete revision of its educational program K-12 and instituted in the Primary (K-4) and Intermediate (5-8) divisions a "continuous learning" approach that was based on the use of performance objectives. Adopting the philosophy of providing an educational program for the child rather than fitting a child into the program, it soon became evident that if a child progressed according to his own abilities and achievements--his learning being a continuous thing--then the significance of "covering so much" in a certain period of time diminished. Wherever a child stopped in his learning continuum, whether it be at Christmas or during the summer, at that point he again would continue upon return. Individualizing the program of instruction at the primary and intermediate levels provided a clue for extending the educational program for twelve months without the traditional concern for the number of hours a subject would be taught per day, days per week, materials to be covered, etc. A nongraded approach based on performance objectives concerns itself not with what is taught but rather with what is learned. When learning is the objective, time is not an important factor.

Individualizing the educational program has taken a different approach at the secondary level. A complete elective program was provided with students selecting, using proper guidance and approvals, the courses they wished to follow. Courses normally taught for 180- or 90-day blocks of time were restructured for scheduling within a quarter system. By going to the quarter system, the district is now offering 187 courses for all secondary students. Ninety-two were offered previously. All courses were planned utilizing faculty and student suggestions.

New techniques in teaching were also studied and implemented. Teacher team planning, large-group instruction, small-group instruction, use of paraprofessionals, television and audio learning systems, independent study, flexible and modular scheduling are all concepts and practices that have been in operation in the Rochester Schools since 1966. Again, if these practices can and are encouraged to operate during a traditional two-semester school year of 180 days, why cannot these same practices be employed during a four-quarter year? The door was again opening for establishing the mechanics under which an extended school year program could operate at the secondary level.

Probably one factor that played an important role in the district's decision to operate on an extended schedule was the construction of a new educational complex housing all children in the district, K-12. Prior to September, 1971, the school district had three primary schools, an intermediate school, and a junior-senior high school. A parochial school that formerly had 400 students 1-8 enrolled, closed operations in 1970, and the school district leased that facility for the school year 1970-71. All of the buildings excluding the junior-senior high school were obsolete and in need of major renovation. The junior-senior high school, occupied in 1961, was designed to accommodate 900 students, but a school enrollment of 1,100 plus increased curriculum offerings necessitated additional construction.

Since the junior-senior high school was located in the geographic and population center of the district, the decision was made to construct an educational complex on the 23-acre site. This complex would house all children K-12 and would be designed to accommodate the educational program described previously. The "open space" concept was employed to permit greater flexibility in building use and in the operation of the educational program. Realizing that the new facility would serve the citizens of the Rochester Area for many years to come, the district installed air conditioning throughout most areas of the complex. Zone controls were provided so that only portions or all of the complex would require heating or cooling, and this would be at the demands of the educational program. The district occupied the new facility in September, 1971, and retired all operations at other buildings.

The new complex serves as a community center as well. Rochester, being an old river community, lacks proper recreational spaces for all segments of the population. Along with instructional spaces provided in the new complex, the site also contains a stadium with track, four tennis courts, a baseball field, two softball fields, and two basketball courts. In addition, the swimming pool has been constructed to permit twelve-month use. The opportunity exists for a dovetailing of educational and recreational activities on a year-round basis and thus make "school" more attractive.

One can see, then, that the development of the Rochester "three plus" system was an outgrowth of a restructure of the educational program and the construction of a new modern facility designed to accommodate this program. It is not a program that merely adds to a 180-day school year. It is a new concept in the school year itself.

Financing the new program naturally presents a problem! Since the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania reimburses local districts for instructional expenses incurred during a 180-day year only, any costs beyond that must be borne by the local district. There is pending legislation recently introduced into the state legislature to increase support beyond the 180 days. The Rochester Area is not considered a wealthy area. The tax base is solid, however, and it is expected that this base will continue to grow. The district fully intends to be extremely cautious in its undertaking of extended-year operations.

The major part of any additional expenses would involve instructional costs. Because of the location of the new complex within the boundaries of the district, transportation is not a major problem. At present, there is little reason to be concerned about increased maintenance costs. Operational costs would increase some but this would primarily be for lighting and air conditioning equipment. Since these operations have been zoned to operate as the educational program dictates, these expenses should fluctuate according to the demand of the program.

Relative to instructional costs, the district has entered into a contract with its teachers to reimburse them for any services performed beyond the 180-day school year. The contract stipulates that additional work will be paid according to the "daily rate" in effect for each employee. The "daily rate" is the salary per year as provided in the contract divided by 180 days. All teachers, librarians, nurses, and guidance counselors who are employed will be paid 100% of their daily rate if they work seven hours per day with an assigned schedule; 75% of their daily rate if they work six hours per day without an assigned schedule; and their earnings will be prorated according to the daily rate if they work less than the required hours. Payment for inservice sessions are determined separately.

Only those personnel who have met full certification requirements for the district and Commonwealth will be given an opportunity to work more than, or less than, the required three quarters. Staff will be hired according to the demands of the educational program. Since the district intends to move into extended operations slowly, the ability of the district to finance extended operations will also determine the extent these operations will be carried out.

As far as problems relative to extracurricular activities are concerned, the district believes these are insufficient to serve as a deterrent for extended operations. Since attendance at any one quarter is optional, it becomes a problem for the family to decide if "Johnny" misses athletics. With the restructuring of the educational program, especially at the secondary level, interest clubs (photography, astronomy) have now become part of the curriculum and are offered as quarter courses. Since all recreational facilities are located on one site, intramurals should be scheduled with little difficulty.

No doubt, as the district has more experience with the "three plus" system, there will be other problems that will have to be resolved. The mechanics for operation have been established, however, and the district believes once it can secure appropriate state and federal financing, the extended school year operations in Rochester will have been through the "shakedown cruise" and, as a result, the educational program will be geared to provide increased learning opportunities to the citizens of the Rochester Area.

27

BECKY-DAVID, ST. CHARLES MO: BECKY-DAVID YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL PLAN

Gene Henderson

The Francis Howell Public School District is located in St. Charles County, Missouri, southwest of Interstate Highway 70. It extends about thirty miles along the Missouri River to the Warren County line. It is about five miles wide and thirty miles long. The total enrollment is approximately 4800 students. The population of about 16,000 persons is predominantly middle class.

The area is typically that referred to as a "bedroom district." The tax base or valuation per student is about $6,000--60% of the Missouri State average. State Foundation monies help offset this difference, but some services and equipment cannot be provided.

The low valuation is a handicap in providing buildings since Missouri law limits bonding to 10% of the valuation. It became apparent in the fall of 1968 that buildings could not be provided to take care of ever-increasing enrollments if the nine-month term were continued. Double or split sessions are always possible, but they are less desirable for Francis Howell than for many districts because the schedule, including transportation time, would require almost fifteen hours per day.

The purpose of the year-round plan at Francis Howell is economy--not so much dollar economy as space economy. The Board of Education had discussed year-round scheduling many times, but had always rejected it, thinking in terms of the four-quarter plan for all students. The main objection to most year-round plans has been the vacation schedule which under the four-quarter plan mandates a recurring winter vacation for some children. This plan also retains the three-month "forgetting period" and a once-a-year opening and closing for students, which seem a waste.

For these reasons this plan was chosen for one attendance area served by the Becky-David Schools--a Primary (1-3) and an Intermediate (4-6) housed in one building. The two schools are connected by a kitchen, with 48 classrooms, two principals, and about 1500 students. Concentrated planning began in the fall of 1968 with a target opening date of July 1, 1969, on a year-round schedule. Plans involved parents and staff.

In late 1968, parent information meetings were held to present the tentative plans for parents' questions and discussions. Shortly after these meetings, a questionnaire was sent home to parents asking if they would support the year-round schedule for a one-year trial period. The results were as follows:

43

83% returned the ballots; 61% indicated "Yes", 38% indicated "No", and 1% were undecided. Of those who attended the information meetings, 70% indicated "Yes", and 30% indicated "No". Those responding who did not attend the information meetings" 54% indicated "Yes", and 46% indicated "No".

DESCRIPTION

The students are divided into four groups, referred to as Cycles A, B, C, and D. They are divided geographically, so students of a family and subdivision attend the same cycle. In actuality, cycles are determined according to bus routes. Six buses serve each cycle.

Every cycle has four nine-week sessions of school with each session followed by a three-week vacation. There is one vacation in each of the seasons of the year. After nine weeks of school, most children are ready for a break. The short vacations seem to prevent a good deal of "summer forgetting" and boredom.

At first thought, it is a little hair-raising for a principal to realize that there is a beginning and an ending every three weeks. Initially, school officials were quite concerned about this, but everyone has adjusted well to the routine of opening and closing. As each group finishes a nine-week session, the buses that transport them must shift to a new area and a new group, which must be carried to school the next nine weeks.

The teachers have two basic kinds of schedules. Some teachers have the same schedule as that of the students. They teach nine weeks followed by a three-week vacation. These teachers are scheduled for exactly the same number of days as teachers who work on the traditional nine-month schedule. Other teachers work full time, except for a three-week vacation required by the Board of Education. These teachers work with one group of students for nine weeks. When that group goes out for a three-week vacation, the teacher changes to a new group which will again stay with him nine weeks. Thus the teacher will work with four different groups of students during the year. A third type of schedule is similar to the second with full-time teaching, except the teacher is replaced during the summer months. It has been quite easy to find teachers from other schools in the Howell District and from surrounding districts to fill in during the summer months. Teachers and students are out of school for the usual vacations: Christmas, Thanksgiving, etc.

All of the special teachers, art, music, physical education, speech, etc., must be on a full-time schedule. A class for the mentally retarded and an honors class are on a full-time schedule. Part of these students leave each three weeks and a new group comes to take their place.

The contract for Howell teachers on the traditional schedule is nine and one-quarter months, or 185 days. Contracts for shorter or longer terms are prorated on the 185-day term.

Becky-David Schools are also ungraded. The nine-week segments seem to strengthen this program because there is no long break in the school year. But the year-round schedule weakens it by limiting the number of available groups in any one cycle for educational placement. The plan as used at Becky-David provides for grouping of students with similar abilities for language arts, regrouping for math, and heterogeneous grouping for the content areas. The ungraded scheme was planned and implemented by the staff and principals with the help of staff provided under the Title III program sponsored by the St. Charles City School District which is adjacent to the Francis Howell District.

CONCLUSION

It has been generally agreed by school officials, evaluation teams, parents, students, and teachers that year-round education is not inherently detrimental to children. The technical operational problems encountered since July 1969, have for the most part been eliminated, or at least greatly lessened. Becky-David has been air-conditioned. Central School will be by the summer of 1972.

The Board of Education made a decision to continue the year-round plan into the foreseeable future and to expand it to the remainder of the district. A grant from the Danforth Foundation will help implement year-round for upper grades--hopefully by July,1973.

28A

LIFE STYLE, LIVING PATTERNS, AND THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

John D. McLain

Science fiction is often written by people with a science background. They base their themes on scientific facts, then with creativity they project into the future what might happen, and by the stretch of imagination create their fantasies. Hellstrom's Chronicle, a current movie, is such an essay. It plays upon the fallibility of the human being and the adaptability of insects to depict the idea that man will ultimately destroy himself while insects will survive and dominate the Earth. It is based on the scientific data that insects, with their short lifespans and high reproduction rates in each life cycle, are able to adapt to changes in their environment rather rapidly through the processes of genetic evolution. For example, some insect species began to develop immunity to DDT in a matter of two or three years. Man, on the other hand, with a much longer lifespan and a much lower reproduction rate, cannot adapt so quickly. The evolutionary law of survival of the fittest works in favor of the insects when adapting to rapid change. Through scientific discovery and technological development, man may create changes in his own environment to which he cannot adapt, thus destroying himself while the insects survive.

To what extent is this a scientific projection and to what extent is it science fiction? John Platt, a noted scientist, reporting in the journal, Science, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, November, 1969, concluded that considering the various dangers of nuclear escalation, famine, participatory crises, racial crises and administrative legitimacy, mathematically mankind has less than a fifty-fifty chance of surviving until 1980. Two years ago President Nixon's Office of Science and Technology in A Report to the President's Environmental Quality Council, quoted another noted scientist, Hans Gaffron, as saying, "At the moment it looks as if stupidity and meanness, combined with the forces of technology are going to win the race toward cultural extermination before reason has a chance to discover the best way to reverse the trend." Reporting in the reputable journal, Catalyst for Environmental Quality, in December, 1971, on the environmental awakening since Earth Day, Gaylord Nelson stated, "We aren't yet prepared to discuss in depth the really momentus question of whether we have to destroy tomorrow in order to live today."

Man has one great advantage over all other living things and that is his ability to adapt within a lifespan, not through genetic evolution but through education. Man has the capacity to reverse the trend. He can adapt to change and give direction to change in such a way that he can live in harmony with nature and his fellowman, and as the late James Allen emphasized when he addressed the American Council of Learned Societies in 1970, education is the key to to survival.

This poses three broad questions: (1) What kinds of learning experiences do we need in order to make us capable and willing to adapt to change and give direction to change in such ways that will respect both the dignity of man and the related integrity of nature? (2) What kinds of institutions does our society need in order to provide those learning experiences? (3) How do we get the people to interact in such a way as to provide those needed learning experiences and institutions?

These are not new questions. Since the beginning of man he has sought ways to adapt to his changing environment; and since man first began to function in social groups, he has sought ways to get along with his fellowmen. He has also sought ways to alter his environment through technological means since the day he began to use his opposable thumb and finger to grasp sticks and stones which he used as weapons, tools, and to build shelter. Along with all this he developed systems to accumulate the knowledge about these techniques and to transmit them from one generation to the next.

After thousands of years of slow and tedious progress, man accumulated enough technological know-how that he spawned the industrial revolution. To be sure, there were concurrent social and political forces that helped bring forth the industrial revolution just as there were other forces that brought forth the cybernetic revolution this past decade, but it was possible only through the accumulation and transmittal of knowledge.

Every society develops many techniques and procedures to teach children what they need to know in order to live and to make a living in their social structure. In relatively-simple, slowly-changing societies, as they generally were before the industrial revolution, most children learned through informal means. There were no schools, as we think of school today, for the common people. As young as our nation is, looking forward to celebrating its two hundredth anniversary four years from now, we had no public schools for the general population in our early history.

The idea of public school is a product of technological change and the resulting changes in the human environment. The term human environment is used here to mean all of the external forces influencing the behavior of an individual person--the total environment, both natural and manmade, in which he functions. The public school emerged in our nation, as it did in other nations, as a system to teach members of our society what they need to know but would not learn adequately or conveniently without some formal structure to transmit this knowledge. School, then, was designed as a way to augment the learning processes already in operation, not to replace them. The more complex the society becomes and the more rapidly the way of life changes, the more dependent the society becomes upon the formal processes of school.

The era of the industrial revolution was marked by a rapid increase in the use of science and technology and by a commensurate increase in the complexity of society and in the rate of change in the way of life. It also marked the emergence of the public common school to help people adjust to these changes. Need has always determined who went to school, when they went to school, and what they were taught by the school. The technologies of education have largely determined how they were taught.

The common school, with the 3R's as the basic curriculum, grew out of real, but newly developing needs of our society. When people grew up and spent their life at the place they were born, the skills they needed to communicate with others were oral speaking and listening. As people migrated from Europe to the eastern seaboard of America and as they moved west in the Westward Movement, the need for the common man to communicate in a new way emerged. In order for people to communicate with relatives and friends from whom they were separated and in order to keep informed about the "land of opportunity," it was necessary for them to learn to read and to write.

The ordinary family, before the industrial revolution, raised their own food, made their own cloth and clothing, and made their own furniture--all from the products of the farm on which they lived. Little trade was necessary, and this was done by direct barter. But as people migrated they needed to dispose of much of their belongings they could not take with them. They needed a way to pay for their passage to the new land. They needed to buy anew, for a new start, when they reached their destination. They needed to be able to figure the price of things; and as they acquired new land, they needed to be able to measure land, to calculate time and costs of clearing the land, constructing a house, barn and storage areas for the produce--they needed to be able to do basic arithmetic.

Our society developed systems to meet these emerging needs--a postal system to carry the mail, a monetary system for a medium of exchange, and a school system to teach the 3R's. The point here is that prior to coming to America the need to learn the 3R's did not exist, and most of the early settlers had not gone to school. Adults needed these skills, but most of them did not have time to go to school. It, therefore, became the responsibility of those who were big enough to do the job but least needed on the farm or in the factory to acquire this knowledge for the whole family. These, of course, were the children old enough to be somewhat independent but young enough to be little use in much of the heavy work that needed to be done.

Need also determined when the children went to school, and need in the city was distinctly different from the need in the farm community. As the industrial revolution emerged, the production systems changed. The domestic system, whereby an entrepreneur distributed raw materials to workers in their homes and collected the finished product, gave way to the factory, initially in the textile industry that employed mostly children and women. Children were a source for cheap labor, in competition with adults; and frequently in a city the children were the chief bread winners for a family. The first child-labor law in England, passed in 1802, limited the work day of children to 12 hours and required the employer to teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic. Another law, in 1819, prohibited the employment of children under nine years of age in textile factories. The first child-labor law in the United States, passed by Connecticut in 1813, also required the mill owner to provide children with instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

School attendance provided both a reason for getting the children off the labor market and a place for them to be while their mothers worked in the factories--which was an all-year enterprise. As schools developed in the cities of America, then, they operated all year. This was standard practice at that time.

Children on the farm, however, were still needed to help with the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of crops as well as many other chores. They came to school when they had time, which was predominately in the winter. Children were taught from the readers and arithmetic books their family owned or was able to borrow in the early days of the common school. Each child was taught to read and compute from his own books, with the help of the slate and his teacher. He progressed "at his own rate." School attendance was irregular. A student was out of school when he needed to be out, and he "picked up where he left off" when he returned. He simply continued at "his own level" in his own books until he finished them, whether this took a few months or a few years.

As cities grew in size and as population densities increased, so did the size of the school. As the number of students increased, it became necessary to divide them into groups. The idea of organizing them into levels of achievement, called grades, emerged, with the work organized so that a student would complete one grade in one year. Advances in the printing technologies made it economically feasible to print "graded" textbooks designed to "cover" one year's work. Rigid examinations were given at the end of the year to determine who completed the course satisfactorily and who had to repeat it. A great advantage of this new textbook system was said to be that anybody who could read and write could also teach, without teacher training, because the logical sequence of instruction was already built into the textbook.

This new graded system of the city was considered far superior to the older system which still prevailed in the rural schools. The movement to consolidate schools in America was based on the belief in the superiority of the graded system. The consolidated, graded school served both town and farm children and created a major conflict over the length of the school year. The lock-stepped system of starting all the students in a grade at the front of the book at the beginning of the school year, and pacing them through the book to its end by the end of the year, with a pass or fail examination at the end of the year, made it necessary for all students to begin at the same time, to be regular in attendance to keep up, and to remain in school until the end of the year. This created a great hardship on the farm child who could not begin at the beginning or stay until the finish. He simply failed over and over again. The length of the school year, therefore, became the key issue.

Two changes were taking place to help resolve this issue, however. In cities, the type of work being done in the factories with bigger machines was becoming "man's work." Labor laws were passed to prohibit both women and children from doing heavy and dangerous work, and the social pressure developed for women to "stay at home where they belonged to take care of the children." As this became prevalent, the need to operate city schools all year ceased to exist and so did the practice. Technologies brought forth by the industrial revolution also greatly altered the way of life on the farm. The gang plow, the cultivator, the planter, the mechanical harvester, released the farm children from work so they could go to school longer. States began to establish a "standard" length of the school year. For example, the concept of a standard school year was established in North Carolina in 1918 with 120 days as the required standard. It was changed to 160 days in 1933 and to 180 days in 1943. The close relationship between the public school and the society it is designed to serve has continued to prevail throughout history and shall continue to prevail in the future.

As our nation expanded westward, it also grew in complexity, becoming an industrialized nation. Factories in the east produced goods for immigrants as they arrived from Europe and moved west. Cities continued to grow around the ever-expanding factories. Transportation systems were built to haul the raw materials, finished products, and people wherever in this land they needed to go. Distribution systems and marketing systems were developed so people could use what was being produced. Local and state governments were formed and laws were passed to make this free enterprise system work.

The school curriculum was expanded to teach not only the 3R's but about the American way of life that was emerging--about the production, transportation, distribution and marketing systems; about the opportunities people had in this new land; about the government and how it works for our society.

The dates of the North Carolina laws increasing the length of the school year mentioned earlier are significant and reflect the trends of the nation. Nineteen eighteen coincides with World War I and the Smith-Hughes Act. During World War I, our society developed new machines and vehicles, new ways to preserve foods, new machines to make clothes, all in the name of the war effort; but the technologies were also applicable to consumers back home as well. The Smith-Hughes Act was passed by Congress in 1917 to encourage instruction about using farm machinery and keeping it working, about the developing trades and industries in the cities, and about home economics--preparing and preserving foods and using sewing machines.

Nineteen thirty-three marks the beginning of the attempt to recover from the Great Depression. Although tax dollars were scarce, the need to keep the youth off the labor market was more important. At the turn of the century, less than five percent of American youth were graduating from high school. It expanded rapidly with the Smith-Hughes program, and with the campaign slogan of "education for all American youth" in the 1930's, the number graduating from high school increased to 42 percent by 1940. This declined to 38 percent during World War II. The Hot Lunch Program also emerged during the depression when children were hungry and undernourished.

Nineteen forty-three, of course, was during World War II. During the war, the school year was lengthened to give mothers more time to work in the defense factories. Early childhood programs also expanded for that reason. New emphasis was placed upon physical fitness and mental health because 40 percent of our youth were being rejected from the military draft as physically or mentally unfit for service.

The "progressive education" movement, which emerged in the 1930's during the Great Depression, reflected the restlessness of our society as the "American system" was failing to meet the needs of the people. We were ready for change and were willing to try out new ideas to regain the opportunities that had so long prevailed with the Westward Movement. But the growing anxieties of war, especially the sudden attack on Pearl Harbor, united the American people into a highly structured effort to survive. The progressive education movement subsided, and a renewed support for the lock-stepped system of conformity emerged.

The modern American industrial empire and whole American way of life has been built upon the concepts and techniques of mass production. Mass production is based upon assembly line techniques which are based upon interchangeable parts. Mass production has changed our nation. It has changed our way of life, and it changed the kinds of work people do. The craftsman and farmer took great pride in his work as he did a "whole job," but people in factories working on assembly lines do the same repetitive task over and over again. There is little reason to take pride in a job well done--the good worker is the one who works hard, does what he is told, and doesn't ask too many questions.

Schools also reflect the industrial development mood. School buildings were built in the image of the factories. Assembly line units were called "grades" as desks were neatly lined up in rows and screwed to the floor in factory-like fashion. Children were conditioned for this way of life by the school by making them sit still, keep quiet, and do what they were told. The "great American dream machine," including the lock-stepped school, rewarded the conformist to make the "system" work--a system which was and had to be organized on highly structured assembly line techniques which mandated high degrees of conformity. For example, Henry Ford once said that a person could have any color of a Model T he wanted, so long as he wanted black.

The tediousness of the factory jobs caused physical and mental fatigue. The idea of vacations with pay developed as a technique for increasing production rates. During World War II, both Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill held that it was patriotic for defense plant workers to take vacations as a means to maintain high levels of production. Vacations with pay became a standard part of the labor contract. Workers wanted to take their vacations in the summer when their children were out of school. Management wanted their workers to take their vacations during the summer when schools were out. This was the only time of the year when there was a labor pool of intelligent, adaptable, short-term workers--the teachers and older students on vacation.

In the 1950's, as the post-World War II "baby boom" expanded the enrollments of our schools, the idea of operating schools all year on a four-quarter system to avoid constructing new schools, was unanimously rejected because it was contrary to the living patterns of our society. The vacation schedules of the American work force in the cities had tied as tightly to the long summer vacation schedules of the school, as a source of temporary workers, as had the agrarian society of yesteryear. Furthermore, other segments of our society had developed programs to "fill the gaps" for students who didn't work. Churches developed summer church schools and camps. Private enterprise developed recreation facilities to occupy the time of those on vacation. Our society has developed life styles and patterns of living keyed to the school schedule. The school cannot arbitrarily violate the way of life of the people. It is interesting to note that at the same time our society was exploring year-round school as a way to save money in the 1950's, they were also striving for universality in education. Nineteen fifty marks the first year half of our youth were graduating from high school. It has increased about one and one-half percent per year since that time; about 80 percent graduate now.

A new era has emerged in the last few years. The launching of Sputnik by Russia in 1957 shocked the world and triggered the United States into a technological speedup to "out-science" Russia. In 1960, for the first time in the history of mankind, a cybernetic system was put into operation--an automatic, self-adjusting production system with sensors to monitor its own performance, with the data fed automatically into a computer that analyzes its activity and gives it directions for continued performance.

The cybernetic revolution will dwarf the industrial revolution and is already doing so. Richard Bellman, a noted computer expert of the Rand Corporation, has predicted that "two percent of the population in the discernable future will be able to produce all the goods and services needed to feed, clothe, and run

52

our society with the aid of machines." Our society has already felt and reacted to the awesome power of this new revolution in many ways.

The people who are displaced by machines must find a new way to live and make a living or die, and they will fight in a struggle to survive before they die. Many blacks and other minority groups who have been relegated to menial tasks in the past are faced with this problem now. The human rights revolution is a struggle for survival. They must win today or there will be no tomorrow for our society.

The problem of displacement is not limited to minorities, however. Forty thousand workers a week are being displaced by machines in the United States today. New jobs are being created, but they require higher levels of competencies. Continued technological advance places an absolute demand upon an ever-expanding quantitative growth, expressed in Gross National Product. This means the inevitable depletion of our natural resources, and, thereby, self-destruction of our whole society; but the alternative appears to be economic stagnation and eventual decadence.

The instability of both our social and natural ecosystems is increasing at such an accelerated rate that disasters are inevitable if the trends continue much longer; but as Gaylord Nelson said, "we are not yet prepared to face the question of whether we have to destroy tomorrow in order to live today."

We did not need to be concerned about congested human settlements when man was sparse and predominately agrarian. We did not need to be concerned about depletion of natural resources when they lay before us in abundance. We did not need to be concerned about pollution when wastes were quickly diluted and lost amongst the abundance of fresh resources. But we must be concerned about all three now--the maintenance of human populations crowded into complex settlements, the use and depletion of the resources needed to sustain those growing populations, and the disposal of man-created wastes which become pollutants when they contaminate man's resources and become harmful to man himself. Science fiction of one era sometimes becomes the reality of a future era. Whether Hellstrom's Chronicle will become a reality or remain fiction depends upon man himself.

Without attempting to suggest solutions to the problems or to look into a crystal ball to predict the future, it is safe to say that our public schools will have major responsibilities in helping our society toil with these vexing problems; and in the process, our schools will undergo major changes. Many of these changes are likely to have major impact on the time structure of the school.

As we attempt to deal with the problems of relevance to real-life situations, education will become more problem-focused, more a part of the community;

and the rigid class schedules for narrow disciplines will be greatly modified. As our society explores the ten-hour day, the twelve-hour day and other modules of time to deal with problems of congestion, pollution and the reordering of leisure time into more usable blocks of time, the length of the school day for each student, the time of day school begins or ends is likely to become variable. As our society explores the four-day and the three-day work week and even the six-day week in exchange for long blocks of vacation time, the number of school days in a week is likely to become variable. As our society explores the rotating vacation schedules of the work force as a technique for maintaining full employment, as they split vacations, and restructure their work days for compensatory time off, and as the extended vacation schedule expands, the number of days each student is in school during a year or when during the year he will be in school is likely to become variable. As our society attempts to adjust to rapid change at all ages in life, the school is likely to become life-long--as the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education worded it, "less the all of part of life and more a part of all of life." We will come to realize there is nothing sacred about the length or number of class periods each day or even when school begins or ends during the day. The number of days in a week or month or year will become variable. The time and length of vacations and the number of years a person attends school full or part-time will also become variable.

The school of tomorrow must be flexible; the school of today, to achieve the goals our society has already relegated to it, should be flexible. We must learn how to adapt the curriculum to the needs of the individual learner. We must learn how to adapt the time in school to the needs of the individual learner, and we must do both in ways that are economically feasible.

Most of the current interest in year-round education today is based on economics. Our society is demanding more for its money, but this does not mean the people want cheap schools. If our society's major goal was to save money, we would not be adding early childhood education, career education, and attempting to educate all children and youth with equality in opportunity as we are at this time.

The clamor for more economic efficiency is our public's way of telling us that the real needs of our society are not being met. They are telling us to reexamine our schools and the educational needs of our society to determine who really needs to learn what and just how and when this can best be achieved.

54

A REACTION: LIFE STYLE, LIVING PATTERNS, AND THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

Richard Kau

I am in no way a fatalist. We will not destroy ourselves. Our desire to live is too strong to ever believe that we will destroy ourselves, but instead we will do everything possible to increase our life span and increase the time to enjoy our extra years. We will continue to spend millions on medical research to increase the number of years we'll have to spend in leisure after our families are grown and we have no economic reason for working.

Schools certainly must change to meet our new life styles.

> I do remember the very small and now out-dated school I attended.
>
> I do remember that it was an economic necessity that all three of us boys be out of school all summer to help in the fields.
>
> I also remember that a twelve-hour day was the minimum day's work and usually chores were performed before and after the 6:00 a. m. to 6:00 p. m. working day.

Twenty years ago I sat in a meeting discussing year-round schools--the fact that long summer vacations were a waste and that the schools and the communities needed to provide a summer program for the young people.

Like most worthwhile needs, it's taken a long time to develop a solution. Henry Ford developed an assembly line to mass produce an auto that most families could afford, as long as they didn't mind its being black. Today in Phoenix, Arizona, not even the funeral hearse is black. Summer school sessions in that city used to start at 6:00 a. m. and quit by 10:00 a. m., but many students left at 8:00 a. m. Now with air conditioning that is all changed.

Our ingenuity has brought about great changes in our society and schools have changed their curriculum to stay abreast of or close behind these changes. But they now need to change even faster.

I believe that the open space concept and year-round schools are a logical answer to the changes in our society. I can remember fifteen years ago when a friend of mine was forced to take his vacation during the winter months and said, "It was the worst experience of my life." He couldn't find anyone who had the time to play golf or go fishing with him. This will all change with year-round schools. This is the opportunity for the schools to help form a new life style for our families.

55

Let's go back a little. Education should be able to teach not only children but also adults how to solve the problems created by a rapidly changing world. A recent example is that we now have a tremendous surplus of Ph. D.'s in chemistry and the biological sciences. There are now medical schools experimenting to retrain these well-trained minds to become M. D.'s and which can convert them to full-fledged medical doctors in two years. We need to find the problems, define them, and offer a solution.

The problems as I see them are:

1. No longer do children need a long summer to help with harvesting crops. In fact, most states now have laws prohibiting youngsters from working on many jobs that my generation took for granted.

   With the advent of working mothers there is no one at home for the summer. Children out of school for three months lose an additional month getting back into the groove of school.

2. Businesses would certainly benefit from not having to schedule all of their vacations during the summer months, and I completely agree with Mr. McLain's analysis as to how business would operate more effectively by having a year-round working force with vacations scheduled on a year-round basis.

   Certainly there will need to be many adjustments in historical marketing conceptions, such as "back to school sales"--but these can all be worked out.

3. There would be full utilization of school facilities. This probably, as a representative of the business community, is the first advantage I have seen in years in Chula Vista. We have seen where four schools now do the work of five schools, with a resulting savings to the taxpayer of $2,000,000. If the year-round schools accomplished no more than this, it would be worth the effort.

The potential of this new concept is unlimited as you have seen. I believe the schools are now going to lead our society into entirely new concepts of working and living patterns.

The three basic forces covered by Mr. McLain are:

1. Need for quality education.

2. Need for change in school calendars to be compatible with the rest of society.

3. Need for economic efficiency of school facilities.

All of these can be accomplished within the basic framework of year-round schools. I know of no other method whereby the schools can meet these objectives.

The next step needs to be year-round school, kindergarden through grade twelve. If we do not implement this entire program, it will work a great inconvenience on the families who have part on year-round and part on a conventional program.

28D

A REACTION: LIFE STYLE, LIVING PATTERNS, AND THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

Don L. Wilson

Let me start with the agreement that society has indeed changed and further that man must not only adapt, but has the capability to do so. With that start of a seemingly safe remark, I will attempt to venture into areas of additional thoughts and possibly disagreement. To do less would be rhetoric, thus a waste of time.

I'm somewhat aware, as a non-educator, of the current challenges of education, the high casuality rate of bond issues at the polls and the charges of relativity regarding process and curriculum.

As Dr. McLain states, the current system is a product of the social needs of the 19th century. This is not without parallel. I'm referring to the parallel of social and youth agencies, a parallel of some magnitude in today's society.

Many traditional agencies are also charged with "doing business as usual" for the last 100 years. You have similarities with many of these agencies, such as dependence upon the community dollar, you through the tax base, and they through the voluntary dollar. Both of you depend upon public acceptance, both have grown together and both have stood the test of time.

Both of you relate to the extended school year as up until now, each of you has had some "territorial claim" in behalf of children's time--agencies in the summer, schools during spring, fall and winter.

Both quarters have had occasion to enter each other's territory. An example is the change from the old fashioned summer school for the failing, to the full bore enrichment program. For the agency it has been the program move into the 3-day weekend, holidays, the minimum-hour day, and Easter, Christmas vacation.

Let me continue with some areas of possible general agreement between education and agency program. Agreed that school is a place of learning, and that we learn outside of school as well as within. You'll note that I've left out the degree of external and internal learning as a compromise. Such an agreement (school is a place) provides me with permission to accept other arenas as places of learning also. Agreed that we learn all year, not just in fall, spring, and winter.

Let's talk to some of the "knowns and unknowns" regarding the extended school year.

58

We know that people have a higher disposable income, greater personal mobility and more leisure time. This has made an impact upon the parks and campgrounds of this country. It is likely, unless there is some reduction of people, or increase of parks, that there is justification of drawing lots for campsites such as drawing game tags for deer hunters.

We know that summer in the ghetto has brought a rash of disturbances. We don't know if the extended school year will retard these problems by cutting into the gang culture or will in reality extend the problem of the long hot summer into the fall, the winter, and the spring.

We know that the extended school year, if coordinated for the whole family, will provide for year-round vacation scheduling. We don't know how many families will or can take advantage of such, nor even the results of the backlash of poor families who are left behind while the well-to-do family vacations in February. That same family may not be able to schedule within a precise 15-day period in the summer.

I'm not sure that we know of the possible change of status from summer programs funded by the millions of dollars through Model Cities; Department of Labor; Health, Education and Welfare; and other sources.

We also must question the impact of the extended school year on the youth seeking summer employment, or better termed "Employer reaction to the 15-day box boy."

I'm sure that you must have talked with yourselves on many of these problems as well as agrument of extra cost or operational savings, building maintenance, bussing, etc. Yes, even the pro and con as to validation of the fact of children learning more or less within the extended school year.

Nor do we know of the impact upon the community, but you must have thought about it, with the youth organization and its financial ability to extend programs and staff day-long as opposed to 3:00 p.m. on. And what backlash is there to the school playground, if they don't or can't?

I would hope that we do know that upon the rescheduling, and before the actual implementation, that there should be round table meetings with the to-be concerned identities. I'm referring to the youth agencies, the United Way, the summer funding sources, the park and recreation societies, the camp associations.

But you, education, are setting pace for the change. You are the "biggie" in the change; you must also be the catalyst for community planning and interfacing of resources and possible modification as you go. You must lower the drawbridge from the fortress of education and open up such meetings at national and local levels.

Let me discuss for a few minutes, the specific field of camping as I know it. I do so at the risk of being a vested interest. Last summer out of the 30 million 8-14 year olds, about 7-$\frac{1}{2}$ million (25%) went to summer camp. The largest percent went to short-term camps of 1-3 weeks. Over 3000 camps are represented in the professional camping movement of the American Camping Association.

The movement is composed of the private-independent camp owner as well as the agency operated camp. Both have grown in numbers and professional ethics and abilities. Both have stood the test of time and provide a valid and necessary informal education component. They are in reality "schools of outdoor living."

In testimony is the City/County Camp Commission of San Diego, credited as a pioneer in the field of outdoor education. In 1970, there were 225 school districts representing some 975 schools who conducted over 2,500 camping sessions. Outdoor education schools operated in 30 of the 58 counties in this state.

I wish to remind you that children learn in camp, things not only kindred to the learning content of hundreds of adult conferences, seminars, and retreats, but things relative to their role in living in society. The art of living, and learning to do so, is really the reason for education, formal or informal. In fact, and as quoted by Dr. Marshall McLuhan, "Most children must interrupt their education to attend school."

To an accredited camp operator, his camp is a laboratory of learning and human understanding, where people learn to live together. This has equally important values to the child from nob hill as opposed to the child of the ghetto. The product of knowing one's self and finding one's self identity and potential, complements both the child and the education process.

It is my hope that education is willing to take this valuable identity, organized camping, into consideration in the movement toward the extended school year. How flexible can you be? While some agencies can adapt with 1- and 2-week-camp session what about the long term in-depth session of 4 to 8 weeks. There must be a way of interfacing the valid contribution to society that is provided by the long term, in-depth camp session. If you are willing to talk, in your local level with camping associations of A.C.A., you'll find that you share common concerns--not only the child, but the reluctance to seek capital funds to build facilities for the "summer bulge."

6

Equally important is the opportunity of instruction on ecology in its proper atmosphere, and not that of the blacktopped school playground.

Let me close with 5 requests:

1. Lower the drawbridge for greater input in the planning and implementation process. Realize that as society has changed so has the planning process within that society. The day of finding fruitful products out of "Peer and Peck" planning is at an end.

2. Don't do it piecemeal, thus splitting the family apart. Cross the boundaries into the high schools, allowing for unity of family planning. Don't stand accused of chipping away at the stability of the family.

3. Do not interpret legislation authorizing the 12-month school year as giving the school complete authority of the child's learning process. Recognize those that contribute with you.

4. Keep it clean, don't fudge and exert internal pressure for the child to enroll in summer school type sessions within the 15 days. Make those sessions part of the process and not just a means of gaining additional state aid.

5. Share the camping profession's concern about ecology, pleasurable integration, and human understanding and recognize these contributions to the child. At a local level meet with us, talk to and with us, and assist in looking for answers--for we too agree that the art of living and learning is .... a full time, all-year job, and for all of us.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Chairman: Wayne H. White, Superintendent, Brevard County School District,
3205 South Washington Avenue, Titusville, FL 32780

George Jensen, Chairman, National School Calendar Study Committee, Post Office
Box 37, Horse Shoe, NC 28742

Oz Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Research, Jefferson County Public Schools,
3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, KY 40218

John McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College,
Clarion, PA 16214

Jack Price, Assistant Superintendent, Programs Division, San Diego City Schools,
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103

SEMINAR PLANNING COMMITTEE

Chairman: Jack Price, Assistant Superintendent, Programs Division, San Diego
City Schools, 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103

Secretary: Margaret J. Loughlin, Supervising Clerk, Department of Education,
San Diego County, 6401 Linda Vista Road, San Diego, CA 92111

Department of Education, San Diego County, 6401 Linda Vista Road, San Diego, CA 92111:
Charles E. Ballinger, Curriculum Coordinator
P. Marvin Barbula, Guidance Coordinator
Agnes E. Bowerfind, Curriculum Coordinator
Jacqueline L. Chaparro, Curriculum Coordinator
Thomas P. Davies, Director, Curriculum Coordination Section
Robert A. Dean, Curriculum Coordinator
Michael M. Norton, School and Community Relations Coordinator
Edna Jo Reed, Curriculum Coordinator
Martin Taylor, Administrative Assistant

Stanley A. McClintic, Associate Superintendent, Grossmont Union High School District,
Post Office Box 1043, La Mesa, CA 92041

Robert D. Muscio, District Superintendent, Lakeside Union School District, Post Office
Box 578, Lakeside, CA 92040

David D. Pascoe, Associate Superintendent, La Mesa-Spring Valley School District
Post Office Box 457, La Mesa, CA 92041

Leonard N. Servetter, Assistant Superintendent, Chula Vista City School District,
Post Office Box 907, Chula Vista, CA 92012

Dwight E. Twist, Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Schools Division, San Diego
City Schools, 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103

SEMINAR CONSULTANTS

Marvin C. Alkin, Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, Los Angeles, CA 90024

P. Marvin Barbula, Guidance Coordinator, Department of Education, San Diego County, 6401 Linda Vista Road, San Diego, CA 92111

W. Scott Bauman, Professor of Finance, University of Oregon, College of Business Administration, Department of Finance and Business Environment, Eugene, OR 97403

Stuart Beville, Division Superintendent, Prince William County Schools, Post Office Box 389, Manassas, VA 22110

Forbes Bottomly, Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, 815 Fourth Avenue North, Seattle, WA 98109

Dorothy Brooksby, National Education Association, 1202 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036

James Burch, Vice-President, Batten, Barton, Durstine, and Osborne, Inc., 650 California Street, San Francisco, CA 94108

Champlain Valley Union High School, Hinesburg, VT 05461
- Lucien E. Lambert, Assistant
- Johannes I. Olsen, Principal
- Paul D. Rice, Assistant
- Arthur H. Scott, Chairman, Mathematics Department

Chicago Public Schools, 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, IL 60601
- Alvin Boyd, Principal, Dyett School
- Evelyn F. Carlson, Associate Superintendent
- Angeline Caruso, District Superintendent
- Howard Denton, Assistant to the Deputy Superintendent of Schools
- Louise Malis, Member of the Board of Education
- Lorraine Sullivan, Assistant Superintendent
- Frank Thomson, District Superintendent

Chula Vista City School District, Post Office Box 907, Chula Vista, CA 92012
- Douglas Giles, Director of Curriculum
- Leonard Servetter, Assistant Superintendent
- Burton C. Tiffany, Superintendent
- John Vugrin, Director of Personnel

Sidney Cutler, Principal, Midway Junior-Senior High School, 3233 Kemper Street, San Diego, CA 92110

Dade County Public Schools, Quinmester Program, 1410 N.E. 2nd Avenue,
Miami, FL 33132
Alex Bromir, Principal, Miami Springs Senior High School
Martin Rubinstein, Project Manager
Carl Sorensen, Executive Director, Division of Instruction
Russell Wheatley, Principal, Henry H. Filer Junior High School

Jack Dollard, Hartford Design Group, 470 Asylum Street, Hartford, CT 06103

Leonard B. Finkelstein, Director, The Parkway Program, The Franklin Institute,
20th Street and The Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103

Thomas Fleming, Chairman, Citizens' Committee for Year-Round Schools,
793 Churrituck Drive, Imperial Beach, CA 92032

Venn W. Furgeson School, ABC Unified School District, 22215 Elaine Avenue,
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90715
Diana Baldwin, Teacher
Robert S. Beall, Principal
Duane Moret, Teacher
Marlin Tarpley, Teacher
Tonita Tawzer, Teacher

Don E. Glines, Director, Wilson Campus School, School of Education, Mankato
State College, Mankato, MN 56001

Louis Griger, Consultant, Division of Program Development, Texas Education
Agency, 201 East Eleventh Street, Austin, TX 78701

Kenny C. Guinn, Superintendent, Clark County School District, 2832 East Flamingo
Road, Las Vegas, NV 89109

Adeline Hartung, Elementary Curriculum Specialist, Milwaukee Public Schools,
Post Office Drawer 10K, Milwaukee, WI 53201

Eugene M. Hayes, Director, Westinghouse Learning Corporation, 235 Wyman,
Waltham, MA 02154

Hayward Unified School District, Post Office Box 5000, Hayward, CA 94544
Raymond G. Arveson, Superintendent
Barney Moura, Principal, Park School
Philip Silver, Clerk, Board of Education
Robert Williams, Director of Elementary Education

Francis Howell School District (Becky-David School), Route 2, St. Charles, MO 63301
Wilma Cole, Principal
J. Dale Dunivan, Principal
M. Gene Henderson, Superintendent
Chauncey C. Randall, Assistant Superintendent

John M. Huffman, Coordinator, Program Development and Evaluation, Department of Education, San Diego County, 6401 Linda Vista Road, San Diego, CA 92111

George Jensen, Chairman, National School Calendar Study Committee, Post Office Box 37, Horse Shoe, NC 28742

Oz Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Research, Jefferson County Public Schools, 3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, KY 40218

Richard Kau, 4203 Acacia Avenue, Bonita, CA 92002

La Mesa-Spring Valley School District, Post Office Box 457, La Mesa, CA 92041
    Donald Cochenour, Administrative Assistant
    Al Lantz, Director of Curriculum
    David D. Pascoe, Associate Superintendent
    Cal Strickland, Lead Teacher, La Presa Junior High School
    Roy Williams, Principal, La Presa Junior High School

Robert B. McCarter, Director of Secondary Education, West Chester Area School District, 320 North Church Street, West Chester, PA 19380

John D. McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College, Clarion, PA 16214

Molalla School District No. 35, Post Office Box 107, Molalla, OR 97038
    John Cutter, Pharmacist
    William Jordan, Principal
    Christine Short, President, Molallo Elementary Education Association
    William O. Williams, Chairman, Board of Directors
    Sam D. Wilson, Superintendent

Laurence Molloy, Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 477 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022

Dan Moore, Manager, Educational Programs, Times Mirror, Times Mirror Square, Los Angeles, CA 90053

Russell Mosely, State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Division of Instructional Services, Wisconsin Hall, 126 Langdon Street, Madison, WI 53702

Franklin Pierce Public Schools, District No. 402, Pierce County, 315 South 129th Street, Tacoma, WA 98444
    Marion Cupp, Program Evaluator
    W. Gorden Hansen, English Teacher
    Edward E. Hill, Superintendent
    Del Shafer, Principal

Rochester Area School District, Rochester, PA 15074
Thomas Goettman, Pupil Personnel Services Division
Matthew Hosie, Superintendent
Frank Mastalski, President, Board of Education
Thomas Skinner, Campus Principal

Ruben Rochin, Project Director, ESEA Title III Extended School Year, New Hampshire
Supervisory Union 29, 32 Court Street, Keene, NH 03431

Evan Shaffer, Secondary Director, San Diego City Schools, 4100 Normal Street,
San Diego, CA 92103

Larry Sibelman, Vice President, United Teachers/Los Angeles, 234 Loma Drive,
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Bob R. Sternberg, Instructional Specialist, State of Michigan Department of Education,
Lansing, MI 48902

Valley View Public Schools, District No. 96, Dalhart Avenue, Lockport, IL 60441
James Bingle, President, Board of Education
Joseph Kovach, Newspaper Editor
William Rogge, Director, 45-15 Evaluation
Steve Thomas, President, Education Association

Richard VanHoose Superintendent, Jefferson County Public Schools, 3332 Newburg Road,
Louisville, KY 40218

Jack Walsh, Supervisor, San Diego County, County Administration Center,
San Diego, CA 92101

Wayne H. White, Superintendent, Brevard County School District, 3205 South Washington
Avenue, Titusville, FL 32780

Don L. Wilson, Regional Chairman, American Camping Association, 460 East Broadway,
El Cajon, CA 92021